

THE  
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER  
AND  
GENERAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—NO. VI.

JULY, 1836.

CONTENTS.

|  | PAGE |  | PAGE |
|--|------|--|------|
| I. COX'S LIFE OF MELANCTHON  | 273  | V. PUBLICATIONS OF BISHOP HOPKINS  | 342  |
| The Life of Philip Melancthon, comprising an Account of the most important Transactions of the Reformation. By F. A. Cox, D. D., LL. D.  |      | 1. The Primitive Creed, Examined and Explained; in Two Parts. By JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D.                               |      |
| II. TRUE PLAN OF A LIVING TEMPLE   | 291  | 2. Christianity Vindicated. By JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D.   |      |
| The True Plan of a Living Temple; or Man considered in his proper Relation to the Ordinary Occupations and Pursuits of Life. By the Author of "The Morning and Evening Sacrifice," &c.         |      | 3. The Primitive Church, compared with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Present Day. By JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D.  |      |
| III. McCULLOH ON THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES   | 307  | VI. PENITENTIARY SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES   | 376  |
| An Impartial Exposition of the Evidences and Doctrines of the Christian Religion, addressed to the better educated Classes of Society. By J. H. McCULLOH, M. D.                                |      | On the Penitentiary System in the United States, and its Application in France. By G. DE BEAUMONT and A. DE TOCQUEVILLE. |      |
| IV. THE "ANGEL OF JEHOVAH" NOT THE MESSIAH   | 329  | VII. JEDEDIAH BURCHARD   | 393  |
| The "Angel of Jehovah," mentioned in the Old Testament, not identical with the Messiah; being the Conclusion of the Article on the "Deity of the Messiah not a Doctrine of the Old Testament." |      | 1. Mirror of Calvinistic Fanaticism, or Jedediah Burchard & Co. By RUSSELL STREETER.                                     |      |
|  |      | 2. Sermons, Addresses, and Exhortations, by Rev. Jedediah Burchard. By C. G. EASTMAN.                                    |      |
|  |      | NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE   | 403  |
|  |      | For's Sketch of the Reformation—Hug's Introduction to the New Testament.—Paszow's Greek Lexicon.                         |      |
|  |      | INDEX  | 405  |

BOSTON:  
PUBLISHED BY CHARLES BOWEN.

LONDON:  
ROWLAND HUNTER, AND R. J. KENNETT, GREAT QUEEN STREET.

1836.

## NOTICE.

The Christian Examiner is published once in two months, on the first day of March, May, July, September, November, and January, making six numbers, of 136 pages each, or two volumes, of 408 pages each, for every year, at \$4 per annum, payable on the delivery of the second number; that is, on the 1st of May.

All communications may be directed "To the Editors of the Christian Examiner, care of Charles Bowen."

---

### CHARLES BOWEN,

NO. 141 WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON,

HAS JUST PUBLISHED

DISCOURSES ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING, D. D. 12mo.

(*This volume is composed entirely of discourses never before published.*)

"The fervid and eloquent pen of the Rev. Mr. Channing, whether employed, as in the volume before us, in elucidating the truth and the beauty of the Christian Revelation and the obligations and duties of man under it, — or in critically analysing the character, the deeds, and the influence of the mighty Napoleon, — or in examining in prose scarcely less inspired than the glowing strains of the Poet himself, the works and genius of Milton, — can never appeal in vain to educated readers. In truth, we consider Mr. Channing as one of the greatest living masters of the English language; and when to the beauty of style is added the logical force of a well disciplined and highly cultivated mind, — of which, as in the work now under notice, the whole energies are devoted to prove to the understanding, and to make perceptible to the heart, the reasonableness, as well as the indispensableness to happiness both here and hereafter, of faith in the Christian dispensation, — it will be readily believed that he has made a book that will be widely read. We speak not here in reference to the peculiar views of the writer as to the nature of the Saviour, — these, doubtless, though only appearing incidentally, may have the effect of diverting many from his pages; — yet we know not where, in the same space, can be found a more striking and irresistible statement of the evidences of Christianity, than in the first discourse of this volume." — *New York American.*

### CHANNING'S WORKS,

Being Discourses, Reviews, and Miscellanies. 8vo. pp. 600.

This Edition contains the same matter as the first. It is intended, however, for a more general circulation; the price is therefore reduced to \$1.50, which makes it one of the cheapest works now before the public.

THE NEW YORK COLLECTION OF PSALMS AND HYMNS for Social and Private Worship. Third Edition.

Societies and others wishing for this Collection, can be furnished, by the quantity, on reasonable terms.

A NEW TRANSLATION of the BOOK OF PSALMS, with an Introduction. By GEORGE R. NOYES, Author of a 'Translation of the Book of Job.'





THE  
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

Nº. LXXV.

THIRD SERIES — Nº. VI.

---

JULY, 1836.

---

ART. I. — *The Life of Philip Melancthon, comprising an Account of the most important Transactions of the Reformation.* By F. A. Cox, D. D., LL. D., of London. First American from the Second London Edition, with important Alterations by the Author, for this Edition. Boston: 1835. 12mo. pp. 316.

WE are disposed to regard with favor any attempt to throw light upon that portion of the history of the church, which commonly passes under the name of the Reformation. This term usually designates a much more contracted period than it should. To enlarge our views of this period, to show how early and almost imperceptible was the beginning of the Reformation, how many names are to be reckoned among its instruments before the appearance of those to whom it is chiefly ascribed, how remarkable were the concurring circumstances which then caused its developement, and how natural the influences which rendered it an imperfect work, is a service honorable to every one who performs it faithfully, and useful to the cause of Christianity and the advance of society. It is particularly useful to study the variety of character, which both gave and received an impulse from this great movement; to observe how widely different were the agents employed, and how wonderfully the most opposite materials, — good and bad passions, fierce and gentle qualities, strong and weak minds, the highest and the lowest motives, — were made to contribute to the one great work. It may teach us

never to despair of reform, because the instruments are not all such as we should choose, nor the measures to be wholly approved. It never has been so with any reform. It can never be expected. We attach too much importance to the little or the great evils which attend the first steps of a moral revolution. We are too slow to yield our sympathy and co-operation, too apt to withhold even our faith and prayers, because the hands engaged are not all clean, nor the heads the most sound. We are particularly and beyond reason disturbed by any excess of zeal, the least extravagance or violence in the leaders of reform; forgetting that the moderate and peace-loving, however virtuous and wise, are never the first to disturb the things that are, nor willing to raise the commotions and encounter the perils, without which great changes are seldom begun and never completed. He, however, is a bad casuist and an equivocal Christian, who would draw from such facts and concessions, a sanction for extravagance and violence, or encourage by a look the doers of evil, because good may come of it. It is one thing to have confidence in God and faith in man's advancement; it is another, and most criminal, to advocate any principles or measures but those of truth and love.

The leading characters and events of the Reformation are familiar to all readers. Yet the prominence given to Luther and Calvin, — a prominence secured by their rude and daring traits, and their doctrinal peculiarities, more than by mental or moral superiority, — has overshadowed many less obtrusive but scarcely less important names, and delayed the justice which must sooner or later be rendered them. Among these an important place must be allowed to Melancthon. His name is not unknown, nor his memory unhonored. No name is more closely associated with that of Luther, for no one was admitted to share more largely his intimacy and his labors. Few men have differed more in disposition than they; but this difference did not prevent confidence or coöperation; and if at any time these were interrupted, their very difference of character helped to restore the harmony. They exerted happy influences upon each other. Luther's impetuosity was often checked by Melancthon's mildness; while this mildness, when it became timidity, was stimulated and emboldened by the other's fearlessness. Luther, too, derived no little advantage from Melancthon's superior learning.

At least, such is the opinion of Dr. Cox, who in making the first attempt to give a full and separate English biography of Melancthon, though he can hardly be said to have made the most of his materials and his subject, has certainly done a good service to the Christian community. He has not only introduced a character, new to many, very familiar probably to few; but he has rescued that character from the reproach which has sometimes been thrown upon it, when all the excellence and claims of Melancthon have been passed by with a single reflection on his want of decision and courage. It will be seen, we think, that his defects of this kind have been overrated, while the influence he exerted upon the cause of religion and letters, and the part he acted in the great events of the sixteenth century, have not always been duly estimated.

Philip Melancthon was born, February 16th, 1497, at Bretten, in Saxony. His father's name was George Schwartzerd. But the son, following a common custom of the learned at that time, and the advice of a patron, to whom, at the age of thirteen, he dedicated a humorous piece in the form of a comedy, took the name of Melancthon, as having the same signification in Greek with Schwartzerd in German, — *Black-earth*. He seems to have fallen early into the hands of more judicious as well as abler teachers than most of his contemporaries, and was accustomed to say of Luther, in after life, that if he had been as thoroughly disciplined as himself by the studies of a sound philosophy, it might have moderated the vehemence of his natural temper. Melancthon's temper was of the most gentle and amiable kind, and secured for him the love even of the boys whom he challenged to contests in rules of grammar, in which he was usually victorious. In his twelfth year, he was matriculated at the University of Heidelberg, where his talents, aided by severe application, brought him at once into notice. He is said to have written even for the professors themselves, and he composed, at that early age, Rudiments of the Greek language, which were afterwards published. Having a naturally feeble constitution, to which he thought his situation at Heidelberg unfavorable, and being refused, on account of his youth, a high degree, he removed, in 1512, to Tübingen, in the duchy of Wurtemberg, where he devoted himself to the different studies of classical and polite learning, mathematics, jurisprudence, logic, medicine,

and theology. Of the last study, which was then chiefly made up of scholastic subtilties, he discerned and pursued the more rational parts, to a degree not common in those times. Before he had reached the age of seventeen, he was made Doctor in Philosophy, and soon became a public lecturer, not only in the Greek and Latin authors, but also in several of the departments named above. This was a remarkable distinction, and attracted the notice of the learned generally. Erasmus, in particular, was strong and loud in his admiration. "What hopes may we not entertain of Philip Melancthon; though almost a boy, yet equally to be admired for his proficiency in both languages! what power of invention! what purity of diction! what vastness of memory! what variety of reading! what a modest, graceful, and almost princely bearing!" Writing to *Æcolampadius* about this boy of eighteen, Erasmus says, with peculiar simplicity, — "I am persuaded Christ designs this youth to excel us all; he will totally eclipse Erasmus!" He appears to have become already so general a favorite, that even his religious opponents spoke well of him; quite a rarity in those days.

What were the peculiarities of his religious opinions at this age, we are not told; except that, at one period of his life, he expresses his sorrow for his early zeal in the idolatrous services of the Catholic Church. Yet we find him early the subject of remark on account of his constant and public use of the Bible, which he carried with him wherever he went, kept constantly in his hand at church, and wrote explanations and reflections in the margin. For this he sometimes incurred very severe censure, but, with all his supposed timidity, was never turned from his purpose. From some of his *Epistles*, it may be inferred that he was a believer in judicial astrology, a caster of nativities, and an interpreter of dreams; which Jortin, in his "*Life of Erasmus*," pronounces "a strange weakness in so great a man," as Melancthon. A weakness it may have been, but not strange, we apprehend, among even the most learned of that age. He early foresaw, that violent disputes would arise concerning the doctrine of the Trinity; and pronounced curious inquiries into the nature of Christ to be not useful or necessary. This fact, not noticed, we believe, in the *Life* before us, sufficiently shows the freedom of his mind, and the leaning of his opinions.

From Tubingen, after a residence of about six years, Me-

lancthon, at the age of twenty-one, was removed to the University of Wittenberg, chiefly by the influence of the founder of that University, the Elector Frederic, who obtained for him a Greek professorship. His inaugural oration, delivered four days after his arrival, attracted unusual attention, and drew forth lavish commendations from Luther, who is here first introduced to us in connexion with Melancthon, as his pupil in the Greek language, though fourteen years older than his teacher. Their friendship became at once confiding and cordial, and continued so to the last of life. It is not surprising that a Catholic historian \* should say of them at this period, — "Melancthon fell into the hands of Luther, who abused his easy disposition, and availed himself of all those fine talents, which ought to have been devoted to the service of the Catholic Church." We do not see that either of these individuals abused the other. On the contrary, Luther's strong passions were singularly restrained by the gentleness of his favorite coadjutor, and seldom vented themselves upon him with the violence that many experienced. The union of two such minds, the coöperation of talents and tempers so remarkable, yet so different, is one illustration of the fact already adverted to, that the wisdom of Providence, above that of man, selects and uses the most various instruments for the same work. In the fierce contests which were then waged between the disciples of the Scholastic and of the Peripatetic philosophy, contests which often ended in the palpable and cutting arguments of fists, clubs, and swords, Luther and Melancthon came to no rupture, though the former made great use of Aristotle, and the latter condemned him. To revive the low state of philosophy and literature, was now Melancthon's great aim; yet so low was it, that the very attempt subjected him to half-suppressed reproaches and slanders, while his talents and fame awed even the prejudices of such opponents. His lectures upon Homer and the Greek text of St. Paul, inspired the great body of the theologians, high and low, with the love of Greek, as Luther tells us in his Letters, in which he calls him — "the most learned, and most truly Grecian, Philip Melancthon:" — "he is a mere boy and a stripling, if you consider his age; but our great man and master, if you reflect on the variety of his knowledge, which extends to almost every book."

---

\* M. Baillet.

While Melancthon was thus devoted and successful in imparting his own interest in classic literature, though under every disadvantage from an ignorant, indolent, and licentious, yet professedly most religious age, — its very religion being at once the offspring and guardian of its ignorance, and opposing the most formidable obstacles, — he labored to engage this revival of letters, and use all its power, in behalf of sacred studies. This appears in one of his first orations at Wittenberg, on “reforming the studies of youth,” of which Dr. Cox translates a large portion. We make an extract, which will give some idea of his mode of treating such subjects, and of his aim.

“But the manner in which you apply to *sacred studies* is of the greatest importance. These, above all other pursuits, require judgment, experience, and diligence; and remember that the perfume of divine ointments, so to speak, far surpasses the aromatics of human literature. Under the guidance of God, the cultivation of the liberal arts will be rendered subservient to sacred objects; as Synesius intimates to Herculanus, ‘the noblest employment of life, is to use philosophy as a guide to divine knowledge.’ If this should not be quite obvious to any one, let him consider that brass was sent by the King of Tyre for the temple of Solomon, as well as superior metal: so it is in reference to theology, which comprehends Hebrew and Greek literature, for the Latins drink from these streams and sources, and those foreign languages are requisite to be known, lest we should appear nothing better than ciphers among theologians. But there the accuracies and beauties of language will be seen, and the genuine sense of terms and expressions discovered with noontide evidence. Having ascertained the literal meaning of words, we shall be able to pursue the course of argument notwithstanding any frigid glosses, discordant comments, or other hindrances that may be interposed.” . . . . .

“The great importance then of giving a new impulse and direction to your studies, and the manner in which they are likely to become conducive to your mental and moral character, are sufficiently obvious. Who can help deploring the state of our immediate predecessors, who, abandoning the light of learning, plunged into Tartarean darkness, and took up with the very dregs of knowledge? And who is not affected at the lamentable state of our own times, deprived by negligence of our ancient authors, and of all the advantages which would have accrued from their writings, had they been preserved? You should understand, therefore, the difficulties which attend the acquisition of the most valuable knowledge; nevertheless, industry will so overcome them, that I

trust you will obtain that which is of real importance with far less expense of time and trouble, than is generally devoted to what is useless." — pp. 31, 32.

The period of which we are writing was one of profound calm in the bosom of the Church. It cannot be said the Reformation had not begun, for its elements had been repeatedly agitated, and they were now only slumbering to gather new force. The commotions caused by Waldus, as early as the twelfth century, by Wickliff in the fourteenth, and Huss in the fifteenth, all of whom, with many others, had openly and boldly inveighed against the errors of Popery, had subsided. Those errors continued in all their strength, and the corruptions of the Church and her clergy were rank and shameless. The sale of indulgences, which had been occasionally resorted to for three or four centuries, for the private emolument of those who dispensed them, became more public and enormous, until, in 1517, the infamous Tetzal, having pursued his traffic with great success in the neighbourhood of Wittenberg, Luther and Melancthon, both professors in the University, were completely roused. Luther of course was the first to act, though Melancthon, who gives a particular account of the whole controversy, was neither unconcerned nor neutral. He says Luther himself "did not in the least suspect or dream of the change about to be accomplished, nor indeed of rooting out indulgences." Luther issued his ninety-five propositions against Tetzal, which may be considered the first act in what the timid Erasmus called the "Lutheran Tragedy"; but he at the same time wrote respectful and even humble letters to the Pope, and was much displeased with the students of Wittenberg, for having burned Tetzal's propositions in return for similar treatment of his own writings. Indeed, if the facts which Dr. Cox gives, may be relied on, there was more caution and moderation in the conduct of Luther at that time, than we have been wont to allow him. His three controversies with the Cardinal Cajetan, whom Leo the Tenth commissioned to meet him at Augsburg, terminated peaceably; and even in 1519, Miltitz, the successor of Cajetan, prevailed upon him to write a submissive letter to the Pope. In all these disputations, Melancthon evidently aided, as well as approved, the efforts of Luther. And in the six days' discussion at Leipsic between Eckius the great papal advocate, and Carlstadt, another professor of Wittenberg and a zealous reformer, Melancthon is said to have gone up to Carlstadt so often, in

the midst of the debate, to whisper useful suggestions, that Eckius was provoked to exclaim at last, "Hold your tongue, Philip, and mind your own business."

This was the beginning of Melancthon's public agency in the work of the Reformation. It drew him at once into the controversy, and he did not shrink from it. He gives in a letter his opinion of the disputants, allowing erudition and ingenuity to Eckius, but claiming higher excellence for Luther, who had taken the place of Carlostadt in the discussion, and conducted it with a power, which was overcome only "by noise and gesture." This account brought upon Melancthon a violent attack from Eckius, which he answered by a tract, written with such mildness and acuteness, that it proved highly serviceable to the Lutheran cause. All that is here given us of this tract, exhibits its author as frank, intelligent, firm, and charitable, to a far greater degree than was common in the controversies of that day. We see no cowardice or indecision, nor a particle of bitterness or partisan ambition. His meekness and honesty are striking. "He is, believe me, the dearest of all my friends," he writes, "who is most honest and downright in his remarks; for you know, as it is not my disposition to dissemble, so I always look upon flattering friends as they deserve."

Melancthon was so assiduous in the discharge of his duties in the University, that the omission of his lectures for the single day of his marriage, was a matter of public remark, and thrown into pleasant verse. This was in 1520, and the connexion then formed was of the happiest kind, giving him, for thirty-seven years, a wife eminent for piety and active benevolence. Their house was free to all, and was crowded with applicants for every kind of aid. None were refused, but all treated with that attention and generosity, which show him to have been more kind than wise; for it not only made a heavy tax upon his time, but exposed him to great impositions. He seems always to have been perfectly reckless of compensation for his own labors, and foolishly prodigal of his limited means. He had four children, and no press of public engagements ever made him forgetful of parental duties or domestic comforts.

The time had now come to test Melancthon's courage, and compel him either to retreat, or stand in the very front of the battle. It was in this year, that Luther was put under the ban of the Church; and though the Pope's bull against him was

violently resisted and never fully executed, it had the effect of producing the crisis. His books were burnt. He, on the other hand, declared, that if he did not himself burn the whole pontifical code, it would only be from want of fire. Fire was found, and, in December, 1520, the bull and all similar documents were committed to the flames, and the die was cast. Melancthon was at his post at Wittenberg, but his pen was busy and his spirit strong for the condemned heretics. "Martin still lives and prospers, notwithstanding the indignation and fury of Leo, to whom all things have hitherto been supposed possible. Nobody approves the bull which Eckius is enforcing, unless it be those who are more concerned for their own ease and indulgence than for the success of the Gospel." The Diet at Worms follows; Luther appears before it, but recants nothing; its formidable edict is issued against him, and his danger is such, that his patron, the Elector, seizes him on his return from the Diet, and conceals him in the castle of Wartenberg for safety. This act placed Melancthon virtually at the head of the Reformers. So Luther represented the matter to him from his place of confinement, and so Melancthon himself regarded it. His constitutional melancholy, combining with his humility, made him tremble under the responsibility; but he did not waver. He confronted the many opposers who started up in the absence of the heresiarch, at home and abroad. He directed not only his learning, but his powers of sarcasm, against the divines of the Sorbonne in France, who had published a formal condemnation of Luther's writings. He promptly answered them by "An Apology for Luther, in Opposition to the furious Decree of the Parisian Theologasters." This pamphlet is fearless and searching. Its tone and power may be judged of by a single sentence: "You do not accuse, or convince by argument, but, contrary both to divine and human laws, at once *condemn*, and for no other reason than because you are the Sorbonne divines and lords of our faith to be sure! For shame! For shame! But stay, I must not treat the *Sorbonne* so irreverently!—The Sorbonne only is to be believed *without SCRIPTURE!*" This was but one of several able controversial pieces published by Melancthon this first year of the open revolt. Nor pamphlets alone. His great work, "*Loci Communes Theologici*," appeared about the same time, became at once popular in France and Italy as well as at home, and was spoken of by many in all places as "the best book next to the

holy Scriptures." This work treats fully of almost every doctrine and duty, that has ever been drawn into controversy. It is decidedly trinitarian, and sufficiently orthodox for all but the Pope, and his thorough adherents. Its influence, however, must have been altogether in favor of free inquiry, the great hinge of the Reformation, and few works are supposed to have done better service to the cause. The power of calm faith which it manifests, and the spirit of piety and meekness which it breathes, are refreshing in the midst of such denunciations as came from almost every other quarter, not excepting by any means his brothers Luther and Calvin, much as they praised this work. The latter published an edition of it at Geneva in 1551, eulogizing its author in the strongest terms. A better eulogy would have been a slight portion of the same spirit.

During this memorable year, an attempt was made by the Augustinian Friars at Wittenberg to abolish private masses. The Elector, well-disposed but alarmed, remonstrated; wherefore Melancthon was chosen, with five others, to consider and carry it through. In their report to the Elector, they strongly urged him "to put an end to the Popish masses throughout his whole territory, and not to be deterred by the reproaches of those, who would brand him with the name of Heretic or Hussite." Frederic was still in favor of deferring, but they insisted and prevailed; so far as their act and influence could go, the measure was carried, and the Elector connived at innovations which he dared not publicly sanction.

It is well known, that Luther occupied himself, during his singular imprisonment by the Elector, in preparing his German version of the Scriptures for publication, on which he labored indefatigably. He tells us, — "I translated not only the Gospel of John, but the whole New Testament, in my Patmos; and Melancthon and I have begun to revise the whole." — Melancthon had aided him in this work before he left his place of concealment; and when, in March, 1522, Luther resolved to face the world again at all hazards, and returned to Wittenberg without consulting even Frederic, Melancthon and four others engaged with him in the work, and published it in separate portions, until the whole was completed in 1530. About this time, Melancthon's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans was also published; not by its author, but by Luther, who, with his wonted boldness, stole the manuscript, printed it, and then apologized by saying, that he had only

done what Melancthon ought to have done, and that he should do the same with his Comments on other parts of the Bible, if he did not send them out himself. The appearance of different portions of the Bible, in this gradual way, and with the authority of such names, gave a prodigious impulse to the Reformation. A counter influence, however, was felt from the mad zeal of a few of the Reformers, especially Carlostadt, — from the general division in their ranks on the Sacramental controversy, one of the most childish and violent, yet one of the most instructive of all controversies, — and from the death, in 1525, of Frederic the Elector, the early friend, and steady though timid defender of the heretical cause. In the controversy just referred to, Melancthon stood with Luther in support of the real presence, against Zuingle, with whom he afterward held a personal public discussion, though to no purpose. Still he labored to effect a reconciliation between the parties, which was repeatedly prevented by the violence of Luther, but was partially accomplished many years later, after the death of Zuingle. There was another controversy, of a less public nature, between Luther and Erasmus, in which the former called Erasmus all manner of hard names, and Melancthon as usual endeavoured to soften his asperity. Dr. Cox tells us, that Melancthon himself received long and artful letters from Erasmus, endeavouring to prejudice him against Luther and the unpopular side. We incline to think that Dr. Cox makes Erasmus worse than he was; for, though there is evidence of his timidity and duplicity, enough to make one blush and weep for the man, it is not to be forgotten that his writings and early efforts were decidedly for reform, that there was scarcely a corrupt opinion or practice of the Romish Church which he did not assail before Luther, and that he gave some reason for that common saying of the day: "Erasmus laid the egg, and Luther hatched it."\* We have no thought of palliating the shrinking and shuffling policy of Erasmus. He was not made for a Reformer of the age in which he lived, and might never have removed the deep-rooted evils of any age. He understood himself better than he undersood the claims of Christianity at such a time, when

---

\* Erasmus, however, is reported to have said, in reference to this proverb, "But I laid a hen's egg, and Luther hath hatched a very different bird."

he said, "I had no inclination to die for the sake of the truth. Every man hath not the courage requisite to make a martyr; and I am afraid, that, if I were put to the trial, I should imitate St. Peter." \* This is melancholy. But neither this, nor any degree of weakness, should prevent our acknowledging the eminent services which he rendered, at different times and in many ways, to the cause of truth and letters. We have thought that the character of Melancthon presents a happy medium between those of Luther and Erasmus; combining enough of the decision of the one with the caution of the other, without the violence or cowardice of either. And we are struck with a fact which Cox relates of Luther, that he was found on one occasion drawing his own and other characters in the following brief sentence: "Res et verba, Philippus; verba sine rebus, Erasmus; res sine verbis, Lutherus; nec res, nec verba, Carolostadius."

A prominent act in the life of Melancthon is the part he took in the great Diet of Augsburg, at which the Emperor Charles the Fifth presided, in 1530. Luther, having been proscribed by the edict of Worms, could not be present, and the Reformers, to whom the occasion was one of most anxious interest, threw the chief labor and responsibility on Melancthon. He was prevailed upon, though his diffidence resisted for some time, to draw up for the Emperor, and the papal delegates, an extended statement of the views of his own party. The result was the celebrated *Confession of Augsburg*, from the pen of Melancthon. It was presented both in German and Latin, and, when it was read and the Catholics were asked if they could overthrow it out of the Scriptures, even Eckius declared,—"No; by the Holy Scriptures we cannot overthrow it, but we may by the Fathers." This they attempted in the statement offered in reply, which was sustained by Charles in an oration that Melancthon calls infamous. Every attempt was made to awe or win back the Protestants to the infallible church. Melancthon was particularly assailed, in the hope that his gentle nature would yield. It did yield every thing unimportant, and in the final conference, in which the whole matter was left to him and Eckius, the principal points of dispute were reduced to three, mass, vows, and the celibacy of priests. Here neither side would make any

---

\* Jortin's *Life of Erasmus*, Vol. I. p. 250.

concessions, and Melancthon, unyielding in principle but dreading the consequences, writes — “We expect violent measures, for no moderation can satisfy the Popish faction. They, in fact, seek our destruction. Pray that God may preserve us.” A decree was at length issued, the Diet having been in session from June to November, condemning the new doctrines utterly, and putting all who refused to disown them under the ban of the empire. The Protestant princes and divines retired dissatisfied and disappointed, but not dismayed. They immediately took defensive measures for the preservation of their liberties. The following description of one of their conferences is pleasant, and exhibits some of Melancthon's most remarkable traits.

“Soon after these transactions, Melancthon, Luther, and other divines met together to consult on the best measures to be adopted in the present exigency. After having spent some time in prayer to God, from whom alone they could expect adequate assistance, Melancthon was called suddenly out of the room, from which he retired under great depression of spirits. He saw during his absence some of the elders of the reformed churches with their parishioners and families. Several children were also brought hanging at the breast, while others a little older were engaged in prayer. This reminded him, he said, of the prophetic language, ‘Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger.’ Animated by this interesting scene, he returned to his friends with a disencumbered mind and a cheerful countenance. Luther, astonished at this sudden change, said, ‘What now! what has happened to you, Philip, that you are become so cheerful?’ ‘O sirs,’ replied Melancthon, ‘let us not be discouraged, for I have seen our noble protectors, and such as I will venture to say will prove invincible against every foe!’ — ‘And pray,’ returned Luther, thrilling with surprise and pleasure, ‘who and where are these powerful heroes?’ — ‘Oh!’ said Melancthon, ‘*they are the wives of our parishioners and their little children, whose prayers I have just witnessed, — prayers which I am satisfied our God will hear: for as our heavenly Father and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ has never despised nor rejected our supplications, we have reason to trust that he will not in the present alarming crisis.*’” — p. 187.

Melancthon's services at this time were in great demand. There seems to have been a peculiar confidence reposed both in his learning and discretion. Almost all important transac-

tions, especially in writing, were intrusted to him. A Directory was to be composed for the use of the reformed churches. It was committed to Melancthon, under the immediate sanction of the Elector John, who had succeeded his brother Frederic, and, being of a more decided character, was a still more powerful patron of the Reformers. The Directory, which was thus prepared, was called "*Libellus Visitatorius*," and is worthy of mention because great use was made of it by the Papists, to prove the defection of Melancthon from the principles of Luther. In this they exulted, and renewed their attempts to gain the yielding dissenter. He thus speaks of it. — "I am applied to from Bohemia to desert the reformed cause, and promised any remuneration from King Ferdinand. Indeed my defection is publicly reported as a fact, because, in the little book written for the reformed churches, I have shown an increased degree of moderation; and yet you perceive, I have really inserted nothing different from what Luther constantly maintains. But because I have employed no asperity of language, these very acute men judge, that I necessarily differ from Luther." He was now strongly importuned, by special messengers from Francis the First, to visit France to appease the disputes of the Church there; and soon after a similar invitation came from Henry the Eighth, to visit England. It is evident, however, that these solicitations proceeded more from political than religious considerations; and it was probably well that Melancthon was prevented by the Elector from complying with them, though himself inclined to do so. The public execution of six Lutherans at Paris, about the same time, shows what reliance could be placed upon the professions of Francis; and every one knows that Henry was more interested then in divorces than in reformations. He renewed the attempt more than once to prevail on Melancthon to visit him; but it resulted only in a correspondence, in which the reformer did all in his power to turn the influence of the monarch to the benefit of true religion.

It is an index to the state of the times and to the conduct of most of the Reformers, that the only one of them, who seems to have been distinguished for a mild and conciliating temper, was continually suspected of deserting their cause. Melancthon could not even take a journey for his health, to which he was several times compelled, without being charged with having quarrelled with Luther and separated from his adherents.

And yet there was hardly a council on any occasion of importance, at which the burden of the Protestant efforts was not thrown upon him, and manfully sustained. Another instance of this occurred in 1537, in the general council held at Smalcald, which Luther was prevented from attending by severe illness. The great question there was, how much might be conceded to the Catholics for peace and harmony without yielding principle. And to this question Melancthon was employed to prepare the answer. He did it in a manner, that satisfied many, and should have satisfied all his calumniators, that his principles were uncompromising, and his courage fully equal to his mildness. The paper was of signal use in strengthening the hands of the Protestants, and many events soon followed which gave them new encouragement and success, their cause being openly espoused by several powerful princes. But the happiness of Melancthon himself was greatly abated by his own hypochondriacal temperament, by the misconduct of a son-in-law, by sickness which reduced him to the last degree, and from which, he afterward said, nothing but the arrival of his friend Luther could have revived him; and not least, by the extravagance of the Sacramentarians, and the bitterness of Luther in that controversy. The friends appear to have come nearer a separation on this last point, than on any other, such was the vehemence of the one, and the forbearance of the other. From one declaration of Melancthon, we infer that his mind was not entirely satisfied with the doctrine of the real presence, though he adhered to it. "I commit the affair to Christ, that his divine wisdom may best consult his own glory. I have hitherto always entertained the hope, that he could, by some means, make it plain what is the true doctrine of the sacrament."

The period from 1545 to 1550 was marked by the most desperate attempts on the part of the Pope, aided by the insidious Emperor Charles, to subdue the Reformers, though by the edge of the sword. At this crisis, in 1546, Luther died; and Melancthon, after twenty-eight years of uninterrupted intimacy with one who did much to animate and nerve his courage, was compelled to stand alone. Having pronounced the funeral oration, which Dr. Cox gives at length, he returned in sorrow, but not dismay, to the arduous, and, at that moment, perilous work of leading the Reformation, at least in all written declarations. He attended seven conferences, and wrote all the pieces that were presented, and this without abandoning his

duties as Professor ; for, although the commotions of the day had at one time driven him and his family from Wittenberg and scattered the students, within a year he again collected them and went on calmly with his lectures. Again the University was driven from Wittenberg by the plague, and again reassembled by Melancthon, at Torgau, no cares nor fears being able to turn him from his love of literature and efforts to promote it. His devotion to this is remarkable, when we look at the character of the times, and the press of public, exciting, and responsible duties always devolving upon him. He describes himself just at this time as "tormented upon the rack of incessant engagement, and absolutely distracted with writing disputations, rules and regulations, prefaces, and letters."

We are pleased to see Dr. Cox's independent and unqualified testimony in regard to the death of Servetus, which took place in 1553. But we are grieved and exceedingly surprised to see Melancthon approving of that death, and praising the piety and judgment of those who caused it. And yet we are constantly taught, by the past and the present, not to expect to find any man entirely free from the corruptions of his own age, either in doctrine or conduct. The gross inconsistency of the Reformers of that day, and of some Protestants and Puritans of a later day, read wholesome lessons to those who would study the human heart. It is time, that all biographers expressed themselves as fearlessly, as the one before us, in reprobation of the part which Calvin acted in the dark tragedy now referred to. And the time may come,—it will come as surely as "knowledge shall be increased,"—when few names will stand higher among those to be honored for the Reformation, than the name of Michael Servetus. The principle, for which he contended and died, was the very principle advocated by Melancthon in his last conference with the opposite party, at Worms, in 1557. The subject of dispute was, *the rule of judgment in religious concerns*; a subject in which he was decided and uncompromising. He seemed to regard it in its true light, as the one great question of the Reformation. He aimed, more directly and honestly than some who have followed him in the Protestant ranks, to merge all other questions in this,—Whether the Church or the Bible be supreme? And if he did not always see as clearly, that the same individual and independent mind, which decides for

itself that question, must be allowed also to decide for itself what the Bible teaches and demands, — we must remember, that there are thousands still, who cannot see, or will not own, that principle of the Reformation, though they appropriate to themselves the doctrines, and glory in the success, of the Reformers. The true doctrine of the Reformation itself, and of Christianity, is well expressed by Dr. Cox in these words: "It is the birth-right of every human being to think for himself; he is amenable alone to conscience and to God for his religious sentiments, and whoever attempts to legislate for the free-born soul, and coerce the faith of another, is perpetrating one of the most detestable of crimes, robbing man of his liberty, and God of his authority."

While Melancthon was engaged in the conference at Worms, he heard of the death of his wife. This with other domestic trials preyed upon his health, and made him sensible that his race was nearly run. Still he continued his labors incessantly, and issued the next year, the first part of his great work, the *Chronicon*, comprising a general history of leading events, from the creation to the period of the Reformation. On this work, and in the duties of his professorship, he labored almost to the last day of his life. Nothing could prevent his going to meet his students, after he was so weak that he could scarcely stand. His mind retained all its vigor to the last, and his serenity of spirit and words of parting, were those of an apostle who has finished his course and kept the faith. He died in April, 1560, at the age of sixty-three.

It would not be a wise use of our own time, or that of our readers, to attempt a formal delineation of the character of Melancthon. If we have given any thing like a faithful sketch of his life, every one can best read the character there for himself. Dr. Cox seems to us to have performed the office of a biographer, — a far more difficult and responsible office, than is thought by many who venture upon it, — with industry and impartiality, though not with the highest degree of ability. He has not claimed for the subject of his notice, all excellence, entire freedom from error or failings; but he has vindicated him successfully from every charge of pusillanimity and time-serving. He has shown that he possessed the very opposite qualities in no ordinary measure. He has shown it by facts, more than by assertions or reasonings; facts, which require the inference, and attest the character, expressed by

him in these few words: Melancthon was "firm but not violent, modest but not servile, conscientious but not punctilious." The same character is given him by Mosheim, in equally expressive and merited terms: "In this great and good man, a soft and yielding temper was joined with the most inviolable fidelity, and the most invincible attachment to the truth."

Of the learning, indefatigable perseverance, and great influence of Melancthon, there probably are not two opinions. It must be clear to all, that few, if any minds, shed more light on the principles contended for in that eventful struggle, that no hand performed more labor, and no life rendered more consistent and essential service to the work of regenerating the Christian world. He brought a judgment chastened and enriched by classical study, and a memory stored with various knowledge, to all investigations of truth; and gave evidence that the revival of learning was inseparable, in his view, from that of religion. His almost diminutive figure is said to have continued always meagre, from his abstemiousness and industry. But the vigorous and clear mind beamed from the open countenance, and threw its light into other minds, and distant places, and all subjects on which it glanced, with a power and gentleness blending in higher and more harmonious proportions than has often been witnessed. Germany spoke of him as her Teacher, and historians have called him the great doctor of the Lutheran church; while others, with yet greater felicity, have entitled him *the PEN of the Reformation*.

We leave him with a passage from Luther, as honorable to the writer, as to the friend whom he thus commends. They have often been contrasted, but by no one better, perhaps, than by Luther himself, in this passage from his preface to one of Melancthon's Commentaries;—"I am born to be for ever fighting with opponents and with the Devil himself, which gives a controversial and warlike cast to all my works. I clear the ground of stumps and trees, root up thorns and briars, fill up ditches, raise causeys, and smooth the roads through the wood. But to Philip Melancthon it belongs, by the grace of God, to perform a milder and more grateful labor,—to build, to plant, to sow, to water, to please by elegance and taste. O happy circumstance, and shame to their ingratitude who are not sensible of it!"

---

E. B. H.

ART. II. — *The True Plan of a Living Temple; or Man considered in his proper Relation to the Ordinary Occupations and Pursuits of Life.* By the Author of "The Morning and Evening Sacrifice," "The Last Supper," and "Farewell to Time." In Three Volumes. 12mo. Edinburgh and London: 1830.

FOR a general notice of this work, and the other publications by the same author, we must refer the reader to the last Number of the Examiner.\* We return to the subject, according to our promise, that we may go on with and finish our analysis of "*The True Plan of a Living Temple*," having brought it down already to the end of the *Second Part*.

The author, having ascertained, as we have seen, the condition and relations of man, viewed as a subject of God's Universal Kingdom; and having shown that it is his main object, in this relation, to fulfill well the duties of that condition in life, in which he finds himself placed; proceeds in the *Third* part of the work before us, to inquire "into the best *mode* of accomplishing this object." It is not however his design to give particular directions for the conduct of life in this part, — these being reserved for the fourth or concluding portion of the treatise, — but to point out the *General Method*, by which the real objects of the present existence may be best secured. In addressing himself to this purpose, he first considers Life, or the situation of men in this world, as divided into "three great fields." The first embraces that high or "Ideal" field, in which the great and pure conceptions of the soul find their fitting objects. The second comprises that visible and tangible "diurnal sphere," in which are contained the common interests, the hourly vexations, the rough contentions, the daily occupations, and never-ceasing labors of man; — in a word, the "Actual" and palpable interests of this present life. And the third includes those more minute and more evanescent duties, "which it requires a finer eye to perceive, and much good conscience to improve; but which have a powerful, though often imperceptible influence on the successful issue of the more obvious and rougher duties which are more constantly in view." On these "three

---

\* Christian Examiner, Number LXXIV., for May, 1836, p. 169.

fields" of duty our limits now scarcely permit us to enter. We can do no more than point out a few positions taken by our author, which seem to us to be either peculiar to him, or important in the practical philosophy of life.

In regard to the "Ideal, — or the Doctrine relating to a high standard of Excellence," the prominent position is this; — "That in order to accomplish the object proposed to man, as a subject of the kingdom of God, he must be careful to preserve a high or pure feeling of the degree of excellence which he is capable of attaining, — in other words, his notion of ideal excellence must be maintained in full power." In illustrating this very important maxim, he very properly takes a distinction between making this high excellence or *beau idéal* of conduct, or, in other words, perfection, the definite *object* which a man should propose to himself, — and employing this imaginary perfection as a beautiful and inspiring *means* of aiding him in the performance of actual duties, which are the proper object of man, considered as a subject of the kingdom of God. There is, certainly, a wide difference, as has already been said, between considering this perfection a fixed and absolute object of desire, beyond which, from its very definition, there is nothing to be done or gained, and regarding it as an Ideal Model, which varies with the attainments of every individual, and with the attainments of the same individual at different times. There is a plain difference between aiming at an impossible and inconceivable perfection of these essentially imperfect natures of ours, considered as a definite and ultimate result, and placing before us a degree of excellence not yet attained, which, like Virgil's Galatea, only so far reveals itself to our mental vision, as to stimulate pursuit, and ever flees as we pursue;

"Et fugit ad salices, et se cupit ante videri."

And as in all the Arts of Design, which minister to our intellectual tastes, no high excellence can ever be achieved, but by placing before the mind a model of beauty which has never been realized in the most admirable productions of genius; so, in that most lovely and excellent as well as difficult of all arts, — the *Art of Right Ordering one's own Life*, we must have always present before the mind a beauty of thought, sentiment, and conduct, which will never permit us to remain satisfied with ourselves as we are, but urges us

to be pressing continually onward, to a high and still higher mark in our high calling. This is the only true and available meaning of those much mystified precepts, which may be all summed up in the injunction, — “*Strive after perfection.*” He who hopes to gain a sinless and impeccable state of character, will certainly be baffled in his aim ; and he who, in the literal sense of the terms, aspires to be “perfect, as God is perfect,” aspires to become God. This, according to our author, if we rightly understand him, is the use that should be made of the “Ideal” in fulfilling the proper object of life.

Passing several affiliated topics, we come next to the “Actual” field of human duty. This second compartment is regarded as comprising those “rougher and more substantial labors which belong to every man as the occupant of a definite station amidst actually existing interests.” It is the great field of real life, and the author, properly, as we think, assumes the position, that the successful discharge of the duties herein individually imposed upon us, ought to be the great object of our endeavours, and every thing else should have a direct reference to these duties. Some remarks follow on the “dangers incident to minds too exclusively occupied with notions of ideal excellence,” and a reply is given to the question, “how life and its incidents ought to be viewed,” which contain some very judicious and practical remarks. We may not stop to quote them, but recommend them to the earnest attention of that not altogether uninteresting, but rather useless class of persons, who, standing aloof from all hearty and affectionate intercourse with ordinary life, and burying themselves in comparative retirement, are mainly occupied with reveries concerning an ideal excellence of human nature. They should remember that this excellence, after all, is only a relative thing, and, as far as it is attainable, is not to be gained by discoursing “about it and about it,” however eloquently, but by an earnest grappling with Duty in whatsoever form it comes ; and by a faithful, kind, cheerful obedience to the claim of the passing hour, however humble it may be. “To work !” says one, whose affectations of style, and constant straining after point and originality of phrase do not prevent him from being, occasionally, an effective writer, — “What incalculable sources of cultivation lie in that process, in that attempt ; how it lays hold of the whole man, not of a small, theoretical calculating fraction of him, but of the whole practical, doing and daring

and enduring man ; thereby to waken dormant faculties, root out old errors, at every step. He that has done nothing, has known nothing. Vain is it to sit scheming and plausibly discoursing ; up and be doing ! If thy knowledge be real, put it forth from thee. . . . . *Do* one thing, for the first time in thy life do a thing ; a new light will rise to thee on the doing of all things whatsoever. Truly, a boundless significance lies in *work*."

The third and last "field" now opens on our view. It is that of "Small Duties" ; — a field much neglected in the labors of moralists, but one, on every account, most worthy of assiduous cultivation. It comprises that class of minor acts, so called, which makes up by far the greater part of the moral probation of most persons. The occasions for great and difficult virtue are rare, and the triumphs of a Christian man are not, ordinarily, to be won in any single memorable campaign, but in a constant succession of little conflicts, that require more circumspection and watchfulness, than courage or hardihood. It is in the affairs of the passing day and fleeting hour, — in the ordinary intercourse of business, — in our quiet relations with neighbours and friends, — in the noiseless paths of common life, — in its little vexations, disappointments, temptations, pains, and pleasures, — in the bosom of our families, and around the domestic fire-side, — that we are, for the most part, to form and mature our characters.

So it is with the deterioration of our moral powers, and with the growth of sin. We must have been little observant of life, and very heedless of the teachings of our own personal experience, not to have learned, that a willing indulgence in any known fault, however slight we may venture to consider it, infallibly deadens the delicacy of our moral sense ; impairs that "integrity" of aims, intention, and feeling, and that entireness of religious purpose, which alone "can preserve us," and thus leads the way to every subsequent step of moral degradation. It is not apocryphal as a maxim of life, however it may want canonical authority, that "he who contemneth small things, shall fall by little and little." "Oppose the first beginning of evil," is a rule of duty so fraught with practical wisdom, that it has gained a proverbial immortality on earth. The descent to moral ruin is not, commonly, by a sudden plunge, but by a gradual declension ; and the most

abandoned being that now grovels there, if he could trace back the history of his sin and wretchedness, would find it beginning in some slight deviation; in some doubtful liberty; in some questionable indulgence; or in some wary or guarded yielding to the "voice of the charmer," which, at the time, seemed all but venial, or too trifling to be noted.

The same general principle is to be recognised in regard to what are commonly called *Little Virtues*. Not only is it true, that there is always more genuine religious principle in the silent, unobtrusive, unknown, habitual, conscientious fulfilment of the smaller duties of our place and station, than in the performance of those more signal acts, which the world, in the plenitude of its wisdom, commonly recognises as great; — but it is also to be remembered, that the pilgrimage of this world can only be accomplished by successive steps; and that habits, — those adamant chains of the soul, — are formed by the repetition of single acts, each in itself so trifling as to escape remark; and that, therefore, if the great rules of Duty be not carried into their minute application among the small cares, unimportant engagements, trifling pleasures, humble aims, and "proximate purposes" of the passing hour, life and all its opportunities will be lost.

And a similar train of remark is applicable to the *Smaller Trials*, and *Lesser Adversities* to which we are exposed. These, whether they arise from our own or others' infirmities of temper or demeanor, or from cross and untoward events of comparatively little importance, or from the milder forms of suffering either of body or mind, will be found numerous and various beyond description. They meet us at every turn, they are with us at all hours, they assail us in the midst of our earnest efforts and leading purposes, and, still more, in our hours of repose, of negligent watching, and of strenuous idleness. They present themselves when they are least desired, and we least prepared for them; they make all the engagements and relaxations, all the circumstances and connexions of life, the medium of their approach; and cannot therefore be passed by, either wisely or safely, in any comprehensive scheme of duty or enjoyment.

We consider the part of the treatise before us relating to this subject as valuable, though we cannot but think that the long extract from Reinhard, marked as it is, by those all but endless divisions and subdivisions which are one of the

characteristics of this otherwise excellent thinker and writer, should have been curtailed or condensed in a work purporting to be original. This is followed by a quotation from Zollikoffer on the same subject, which, though also objectionable on the ground of its length, is yet so just and beautiful, that we should be unwilling to part with it. The admirable section of Fenelon, in his "*Œuvres Spirituelles*," on fidelity in small things, is also referred to, and might fitly, perhaps, have taken the place of both the former.

The peculiar *Situation* or *Condition* of man in this world, viewed as a subject of the Kingdom of God, the *Object* proposed to him in this relation, and the best *Mode* of fulfilling this object having been thus detailed, the author, in the fourth and last part of his treatise, proceeds to consider the "*Rules and Maxims of a Good Life*;" that is to say, he intends to offer a representation or picture, under general heads, of that degree and style of excellence which seems competent to man, and which every human being, consequently, by a due use of his powers, is capable of realizing. . . . . The difference between the objects aimed at in the third and in this last part, is the same as between pointing out the path which must be followed, and giving such rules as may enable him, who is disposed to enter upon it, to pursue his course with steadiness and success." And, in order to avoid a vast number of particular rules, branched out under technical divisions, which are justly considered of very little practical use, since, if a disposition to conform to them already exists, they will not be needed, and, if it do not, they will not be consulted,—the Author, with the view of exhibiting such a picture of a good life as will present a clear idea to the reader, takes the *conduct of a day* as an illustration of his "*Plan*." He describes the natural expressions given to the different parts of a day by Nature herself, and indicates the corresponding style of conduct, by the exhibition of which, man should accommodate himself to the intimations of nature. We deem this part of the book eminently beautiful and valuable, and give an extract as a specimen, which is redolent of the very spirit of repose, calm thought, and solemn musing, which are in perfect keeping with the hour and place described.

"EVENING.—Nature herself, as in the other seasons of the day, has given to this portion of it a character which significantly

points out the duties appropriate to it. The splendid light of day begins to decline ; — a softer coloring spreads itself over the face of creation ; — beauteous tints surround the path of the declining sun, — and heaven opens its resplendent glories to the eye and heart of man.

“ The general duty appropriate to this season, like that of the morning, is that of a careful *composing* of the mind after the tumult and irritation of the day ; — but the morning, as we formerly remarked, speaks chiefly of labors about to be executed, — while evening points more emphatically to those future and invisible issues to which all human labors are subservient. — Vol. II. pp. 330, 331.

Then, after speaking of “ Serious Meditation,” and careful “ Self-Examination,” as appropriate means of thus composing the mind, he proceeds :

“ In the third place, *pleasing thoughts* respecting the beauty of Nature, and enjoyment of those lovely scenes, which the evening, in all countries, presents to the eye of man. This contemplation of the beautiful aspects of Nature may generally be best done by *solitary* musing ; — but, to those who have been agitated or depressed by the contentions of the day, a more beneficial employment of the evening may sometimes be gained by a quiet enjoyment of rural wandering in the company of a friend. But, however indulged, this study of the aspects of Nature is one of the most healthful occupations, not for the body alone, but for the mind, in which we can be employed, — and the Author can state, from his own experience, that there is no occupation that will be recollected with more pure delight.

“ A valley of much simple, but picturesque beauty, — a ‘ long-withdrawing vale,’ — as the poet has characteristically expressed it, — marked by hoary ruins at one extremity, — and stretching towards the other, along the course of a winding stream, into a fine expanse of open and variegated country, characterizes his home. The landscape is bounded, at some distance, by a range of elegantly-formed and finely-verdured hills ; — the whole forming one of those interesting, diversified, and extensive prospects, — with a rich and deep-set foreground, — a softer distance of wooded and upland country, — marked first by scattered country-seats, — and, farther west, by moorland farm-houses, — and, lastly, with the elegant but towering outline of its “ boundary of hills,” — which can be imaged only by those who have been accustomed from infancy to the picturesque forms of Scottish landscape, — or who have, at least, inhabited some district where Nature assumes her bolder

aspects,—and unites, in her creative but fantastic moods, the grandeur of mountain scenery with the rich setting of quiet valleys, or of softly-expanded landscape views.

“For years it has been the practice of the Author to enjoy the ever-changing beauty of this landscape, during a few moments of quiet contemplation, before beginning the business of the day,—and, indeed, in some of the first moments which the morning permits him to enjoy. And before ‘the shades of evening fall’ on the landscape, the same indulgence of quiet meditation on the forms and colors of Nature is repeated; no day, throughout the course of the year, presents the same aspect of this ever-lovely picture;—and whether these morning and evening studies be regarded as mere indulgences of taste,—as philosophical meditations,—or as pious communings with Nature, the image and visible expression of Nature’s God,—the Author cannot help stating in this public manner, that there are no hours of his life which return to him with such a fresh and fondly-cherished relish of enjoyment,—or which he is more anxious to bring before the notice of his readers,—as a sample of the manner in which every one of them may most profitably and delightfully spend some portion of the hours of every day. There is no person who may not find some aspect of Nature, around his home, which may thus bring to him many ‘sweet and healthful thoughts,’—and the remembrance of which may be a source of satisfaction and of great endearment to him,—throughout all the future years of his life.”—*Ibid.* pp. 331–334.

These rules, which are adapted to the ordinary tenor of life, are varied to meet the exigences of those days, which, in the providence of God are peculiarly marked, and by which the uniform course of our existence is diversified. Thus, specific directions are given for the fitting use of days of Rejoicing, of Affliction, of peculiar Exertion, of Religious Exercises of the Sabbath, of Seasons devoted to the Remembrance of the leading Facts of Christianity and to a Review of Life.

These directions are rendered still more definite and available by considering man in the various relations he sustains to his immediate family; to his friends; to his neighbours; to the distressed; to wrong-doers; to society at large; and to the human race.

And, again, as life is presented to us, not merely in the detail of current hours, but as offering “General Appearances peculiar to each individual;” and as these are also to be taken into view in the conduct of a Good Life, they are here placed before us under the following relations;—the present condi-

tion of existence regarded as a Struggle for the mastery between the lower and higher powers of our nature ; as a Scene of Labor and Care ; as a Series of connected Events, involving Unexpected Issues ; and as an Unfinished Scene.

The Treatise is concluded by certain "Estimates of Life," in reference to its happiness and misery, its Virtue and Vice ; of the comparative Value of Melancholy or Cheerful Views of it ; of the Heathen and Christian idea of a perfectly Good or Wise man ; and of the relative Worth of the Argument for a Future State.

These topics are obviously too multifarious to admit of any condensed account, and too miscellaneous in their character to be properly illustrated by any extracts which could be crowded into our narrowing limits. They seem to us to present very sensible, judicious, and practical trains of remark ; and, though they should be thought by any to be not very original or suggestive, or even to border sometimes on that large and well-frequented field of practical religion and ethics, which may be called common-place, yet it must be admitted that their spirit is generally benign, and their tendency always practically useful.

We have thus carefully followed our author over the broad ground of speculation and practice, which he has opened before us. It is broad indeed, since it embraces an enlarged and comprehensive estimate of that "KINGDOM OF GOD" of which man is a component part ; of the "OBJECT," which, in consequence, is thus proposed to him ; of the best "MODE" of accomplishing this object ; and offers those "RULES and MAXIMS" OF A GOOD LIFE, which will enable him to carry this "mode" of conduct to the most successful issue. We hope to find some apology in this circumstance for the extent to which our own remarks have reached ; if, indeed, an apology can ever be needed for any effort to make better known that most profound of all deep sciences, and most excellent of all good arts, the Science and the Art of Living Worthily and Well.

However this may be, we think it due to the writer of this treatise, before taking final leave of him ; to bring into bold relief, and place prominently before our readers, what we deem to be the distinctive feature, and the especial excellence,—the "very head of the corner" of his "Living Temple." We

have already alluded to it in the extract which is placed at the commencement of these remarks. It is the *just estimate he has made of the duties of common life*, of the duties of that particular station in which every man finds himself placed in the present condition of things. This is kept continually in view. Every thing is brought to bear on this issue. It is the *axis* thought, so to speak, on which the author's whole scheme of Active and Social Duty turns.

In no one point, perhaps, are there such great speculative and practical mistakes, even among those who mean to be Christians, as in this. On the one hand, we see persons make religion to consist almost exclusively of the cultivation of certain states of feeling; viewing with great horror those influences which emanate from what they are pleased to call the "world"; detaching themselves, as far as possible, from all hearty concern and earnest participation in ordinary affairs; devoting themselves, often in a neglect of these interests, to a ceaseless round of religious services; hankering, with unappeasable desire, after religious excitements; and, in a word, acting continually on the principle, that the more they disengage themselves from things present, the more perfect is their preparation for things eternal.

This mistake existed, in analogous manifestations, in an Oriental Philosophy, long before the establishment of Christianity. And, in an especial manner, it dates back to a very early period in the history of this Spiritual Faith, and, in forms more or less modified by the progress of religious knowledge, has existed ever since, and will always be found the besetting infirmity of a certain order of minds. In former times, it led, as is well known, to an absolute seclusion from business; to a solitary life; to a denial of social engagements; to monkish seclusion; to an excessive multiplication of religious ceremonies; to pilgrimages; fasts; voluntary poverty; bodily maceration; and to other varieties of self-inflicted torture. And not a little of the same spirit may be seen, at the present day, in the conduct of those who have adopted certain mystical and fanatical views of religion, which in various forms are yet, unhappily, so widely prevalent. And there is one species of this mistake, which is not unfrequently made known to those intrusted with the religious confidence of others, which is greatly to be deplored. We mean a feeling more or less distinctly developed, which is seen to pervade the minds

of tender, susceptible, and serious persons, who are deeply impressed with a sense of their religious obligations, — namely, that there is something opposed or unfriendly to their spiritual progress, in those cares and duties, with which, for the most part, they are obliged, by their condition in life, to fill up their time and thoughts.

But common as these apprehensions are, and affecting and mournful as is the condition of many minds in consequence of them, they are altogether erroneous. No such necessary opposition between earth and heaven, things seen and things unseen, things temporal and things eternal, exists, or can exist. No such abstraction from ordinary calls and cares is required, or is permitted, in the religion of Jesus Christ. This life, with all its interests and engagements, is as much a part of the "Kingdom of God," as the life to come. He it is, as we have seen, who has placed us here, in the precise spot and sphere in which we find ourselves, with that peculiar environment of circumstances, which solicit or claim our attention; and it is here, and here alone, and by these especial means and opportunities, that our religious character is to be formed, our religious welfare secured.

How then, it may be asked, are those very numerous and prominent passages of the Christian Scriptures to be understood, which run thus: — "Set your affections on things above, not on things of the earth;" "Look not at the things which are seen and temporal, but at the things, which are unseen and eternal;" "Labor not for that meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life"? The New Testament is pervaded by language like this; — what does it mean?

It is obvious enough, in the first place, that these passages are not to be literally interpreted, since, in this sense, they are irreconcilable with various other passages which place life, and all it is and has, before us as solemn Trusts to be fulfilled, and make fidelity in a "few things," the condition of receiving "many things;" — irreconcilable with the present condition of life, which was an earlier revelation of God's will, than his recorded word; — and irreconcilable with the whole example of the Saviour, whose life was any thing almost, rather than a religious dream, a state of musing and abstraction, of mere contemplative piety and spiritual imaginings, and gave

absolutely no countenance to fevered and brain-sick excitements of any kind.

What then, the question recurs, is their true interpretation? Their general import is very plain. Taken in connexion with all those circumstances which illustrate their meaning, and viewed in reference to that whole train of reasoning which is fully developed in the treatise before us, we cannot doubt that they are intended, first, to meet and rebuke the natural propensity of our natures to become *engrossed* with present objects. They are to be considered as a strong reprehension of those who labor *only* for the "meat that perisheth" — who make the concerns of "this present" the *principal* object of pursuit. They forbid us to place our affections on things of the earth to the exclusion of things above; on things seen and temporal, so as to shut out of our view things unseen and eternal. And they are intended, in the next place, to direct our thoughts to the *ultimate aim*, the leading purpose, the prevailing object of an immortal being, — an immortal life. But, in thus giving a preëminence and ascendancy to things future, they are not intended to call off our attention from things present, but simply to assign to these their proper place in the scheme of Duty. So far from considering these immediate objects and pursuits as unworthy of our attention, still less, as sinful in themselves, or unfriendly to moral and religious progress, they teach us to consecrate and hallow them all, as parts and means of a good and holy life. They are to be regarded as essentially belonging to one vast scheme of instruction and discipline, which, beginning on earth, is intended to lead us upward to heaven, and onward through eternity. The great duty is to employ them for this object; not to desert them; not to neglect them; not to undervalue them; not to fear them; — but to assign to them their true place and purpose; to consider them as trusts; and to employ them as faithful stewards, who hold themselves accountable for their best use. In fine, they are to be carefully attended to, regarded, valued, used, enjoyed, — but, be it always remembered, not for themselves alone, not as ultimate objects, but in subserviency, and in reference to those higher ends and aims, which centre on an eternal state. Thus are they brought within the scope of our religious obligations; thus are they rendered parts of a religious duty; thus are they all hallowed, — even the humblest and the meanest of them,

—halloved, consecrated, sanctified, as parts of that “Kingdom of God,” which our Saviour announced, labored and died to advance, and for the further advancement of which he has taught us to pray. Thus to use the things of time and sense; thus to view them in reference to the great ends they were intended to subserve; thus to make them means and agents in the formation of a high and pure religious character; thus to act “gracefully, conscientiously, kindly, and piously, even in trifles, and in the most common occupations of life;” thus to make the discharge of active offices a result and expression of Christian principles and sentiments, is to give to the Christian character its loveliest, noblest, and most perfect form.

But there is an error opposite to that now adverted to, not less gross, and yet most prevalent, and more dangerous to religious progress. We scarcely need say we refer to that of those, who, perceiving the mistake just referred to; seeing perhaps unworthy, or annoying, or ridiculous examples of it in their own daily walk, or beneath their own roof; and feeling strongly, moreover, the mischief and absurdity of neglecting ordinary claims and cares; pass over to the other extreme, and make these claims and cares, and a regular discharge of their common engagements, the whole sum and substance of human duty, — just as if all the pursuits of this life terminated in themselves, and were to be followed for themselves alone, and had no object, significance, or use beyond themselves. Examples of this extremely low, narrow, belittling view of human concerns, meet us at every turn.

Now both these errors, opposite as they are, come from a common source. And it is the peculiar, the distinctive praise of our author, that he has traced them both to their head-spring, and followed them into all their meanderings. There is no ethical treatise, within the compass of our reading, where this is so fully and faithfully done. Both errors, as is clearly shown, are to be referred to our ignorance or neglect of that intimate, necessary, indissoluble union, which exists between the things of time, and the things of eternity; between the duties which belong to this life, and the condition of another; between the sentiments and principles which belong to us as men, citizens, friends, husbands, wives, parents, children, brothers and sisters, and the sentiments and principles which belong to us distinctively as

Christians. But this is to mistake, as we have already had occasion to observe, a mere verbal distinction, adopted for the sake of perspicuity in language, for an essential difference. No such difference does or can exist. Christian graces, if the term have any definite or intelligible meaning, are certain dispositions of the soul, and moral and religious acts are nothing less than these dispositions carried into effect. The two classes of duties, if we must continue to employ the phrase, are, in their very nature inseparable; nay, they are identically the same, and they are not to be disunited even so much as in thought. Those principles and sentiments, which are commonly considered as being peculiarly religious, will be but imperfectly developed, if they be not carried into action in the midst of the ordinary duties and cares of life. This is their appropriate sphere. Here, and here alone, are they to be improved and perfected. And on the other hand, these ordinary cares and duties are all to be met and fulfilled under the guidance and influence of those religious principles and sentiments. It is thus and only thus, that they can be well performed, devoted to holy uses, and made to become parts and aids of the Christian character. And when thus performed, when thus done in reference to our religious obligations here, and to our spiritual destination hereafter, when thus done in a *proper spirit*, — we hesitate not to say, that we cannot devote ourselves *too earnestly to present objects*.

Who then is the Worldly-minded man? It is not necessarily he, who gives himself with earnestness and fidelity to the concerns of this world; for this it is every man's duty to do, and is, moreover, the means, and the only means, as it has been fully shown, of preparing for another world. But it is he, who gives himself exclusively to present interests, who pursues them without any reference to their connexion with his future well-being, who makes them the sole and all-absorbing objects of pursuit, whose thoughts and labors centre upon them as final results. This is the worldly-minded man. This is the true child of earth. He is thoroughly of the earth, earthy; and in this earthliness of all his desires, feelings, pursuits, plans, and objects, he has no more interest, or care, or claim on the future world, than if a God-inspired soul had never been breathed into him, and a future world had never been revealed.

And who, again, is the Heavenly-minded man? It is not,

necessarily, he who is exclusively employed in thinking on heavenly themes; nor he who detaches himself from all interest in present things, that he may become wholly absorbed in things future; nor he who retires from the incumbent duties of his condition in the present state, that he may bury himself in religious musings, and spiritual abstractions, and devotional services, — since this is to desert the sphere in which Providence has placed him, to neglect the duties which his great Task-master has assigned to him, and to bury the talent that was committed to his keeping; and it will signify nothing that it is inhumed in what he may deem to be consecrated earth. Still less is he a heavenly-minded man, who, shutting up all his sympathies and charities within the enclosure of his own narrow creed, makes it his sole business to thrust this creed upon all within his reach, and, in his proselyting rage, frightens away, by his noise and violence, all the sweet Christian graces, and outrages all the common proprieties and decencies of life. This is any thing but heavenly-mindedness. But he is entitled to this high distinction, who, under a deep impression of his religious accountability, and a conviction that he is acting beneath the inspection of God, his present Witness and future Judge, faithfully, kindly, considerately, generously, honorably, attends to every incumbent duty of his place and station in life; enjoys, with a glad and grateful heart, all its innocent pleasures; and feels that he cannot be too earnestly devoted to each and all of these present interests; provided he regards them as parts of that divine discipline, which is to prepare him for higher truth and better enjoyments in those more glorious developements of God's all-comprehending kingdom, which are not yet revealed to mortal eyes.

The author dwells, much at large, on the uses and benefits of this view of human duty. We cannot now even glance at them in detail. There are two especial advantages, however, which it presents to us, that we deem too important to be wholly passed over. One is, that it gives a *definite aim* to conduct. If we could look into the minds of many persons, who are sincerely desirous of forming a religious character, and of living a religious life, we should find that their notions are extremely vague concerning what is required of them as religious beings. They are subject to a continual struggle between an impression, not easily dismissed, of the im-

portance of the engagements of this present state, and that supremacy of regard which they cannot but feel to be due to things eternal. They are continually striving after a spiritual state and condition of character, of which they have no distinct conception, but which they apprehend to be something wholly distinct from that palpable and visible scene of things in which they are placed. But in the "plan" here given, a definite object is proposed as the leading aim of existence; and this is the continual improvement of all our capacities, in the use and by means of all the duties and circumstances of our condition, under an habitual impression of our religious responsibility, and in the full development of our religious natures. This aim evidently embraces all minor aims; as there is no spiritual state or condition of character, that is, or can, or ought to be obtained, which is distinct from present objects and engagements, since, be it repeated once more, it is precisely *in*, and *by*, and *through* these, that a truly spiritual state of character is to be formed.

The other advantage referred to, is this. It brings all the employments, duties, business, and true pleasures of life into one harmonious scheme, and consecrates them all to religious uses. And in nothing is this more delightfully apparent, than in the *small duties* and minor engagements of life. These, in the estimate of those persons whose religious systems lead them to separate religion from morality, spiritual culture from actual, every-day duties, are considered as hindrances and interruptions to their religious progress, and they are seen avoiding and neglecting them, that they may give an unbroken attention to services, which they deem more specifically religious; and by which alone, or principally, a religious character can be formed. But in the view here presented, all the incumbent duties of life, the small as well as the great, nay, even the most trivial and unimportant, are equally parts of one great scheme of religious advancement. All are comprehended in the vast plan. The unobtrusive virtues and quiet graces of humble life; faithful, pains-taking cares for subsistence; the education of those committed to our trust; the care of our families; the promotion of order, peace, and concord in the sphere of our influence, however narrow; kindness and fidelity in the circle of our social and domestic relations, however small; faithfulness in every duty, however humble; patience and acquiescence under the lesser

crosses and slighter ills of life ; cheerfulness and gratitude in the reception of the smallest pleasures that shine out upon us, like transient sunbeams, in the dark and weary path of humble toil ; all the good that we have, or can impart to others, however trifling it may appear ; — all are rendered religious acts, all receive a high consecration, all are illumined with the light of a purer and brighter world, by being used by us as a part, and an important part, of our duty as members of the universal “ kingdom of God,” and in habitual subserviency to those aims and hopes, that centre upon an Everlasting Life.

“ And oh ! when nature shrinks, as oft she may,  
Through long-lived pressure of obscure distress,  
Still to be strenuous for the bright reward,  
And in the soul admit of no decay,  
Brook no continuance of weak-mindedness, —  
Great is the glory, for the strife is hard.”

J. B.

---

ART. III. — *An Impartial Exposition of the Evidences and Doctrines of the Christian Religion, addressed to the better educated Classes of Society, by J. H. McCULLOH, JR., M. D., Author of “ Researches, Philosophical and Antiquarian, concerning the Aboriginal History of America.”* Baltimore : Armstrong & Berry. 1836. 8vo. pp. 346.

It is not often that we are presented with a theological treatise by a layman ; not so often as we could wish. There are reasons why we should regard such productions with peculiar interest. Though usually less furnished with theological learning, laymen possess some decided advantages for religious investigation. They can speak out without fear of a congregation, presbytery, bishop, or synod ; and though they cannot be supposed to be so far exempt from the common weaknesses of our nature as to be free from all party biases, they are certainly less liable to partiality than the professed divine, who must be supposed to be enlisted by connexion, by interest, or by sympathy on one side or the other of the great questions which divide the Christian church.

These considerations apply with peculiar force to a work on

the Evidences. What has a layman to gain by vindicating the truth of Christianity? His temporal interests are not at all at stake. His pride cannot be enlisted to establish the respectability of that which makes him respectable. We are disposed, then, to receive what he says as his simple and honest convictions, which he promulgates to the world, only because he deems them true and important.

Another consideration, which makes lay theology peculiarly worthy of regard, is the fact, that the clergy, as a body, are apt to lag behind the people in the march of opinion. Such has been hitherto the organization of church establishments, that it has been unsafe for the clergy, either to examine for themselves, or to avow their opinions. It is certainly folly, — when a man's opinions have been manufactured to his hand by some provident council ages ago, and he has pledged himself to maintain them at all events, — to go over again the grounds on which they are understood to rest. If he comes to the same result, he only believes *with* evidence what he before believed *without*. If he comes to a different conclusion, he has condemned himself to be either a heretic or a hypocrite for the rest of his life. The clergy, therefore, need occasionally to hear some awakening note from the people to urge them forward, or at least to save them from being left entirely in the rear.

We repeat it, therefore, we are glad to see such books as this. We are glad to see a full, free, independent expression of individual opinion. It is in this way alone, that any thing valuable can be added to theological knowledge. The repetition of other men's ideas, the emptying of one book into another, does us no good. Let every man state precisely what is in his own mind. No matter if it be eccentric or paradoxical, provided that it is sincerely held, and has been well considered. Let him give us the impressions which any subject makes on his own intellect, and then we have another independent suffrage, or at least one more distinct intellectual phenomenon, to further our investigation of truth.

The treatise under review had its origin, as the author states in his Preface, in parental solicitude.

“When I first undertook to write the following Essay, I had no intention whatever of making it public. I was solely influenced by the suggestions of parental solicitude to prepare something that should assist my own children to the better comprehension of

a subject, which I deemed of all others most important. But, when the work was nearly finished, it seemed to me that its publication could not but have a beneficial influence at the present time, when the institutions of the civilized world seem to be on the eve of a great change, in which new opinions must subvert ancient prejudices, and society be regulated by a theory of principles very different from those, which have hitherto influenced the interests of mankind." — p. v.

We are glad that he has published his thoughts. As yet, it is true, they have not made much noise except in his own immediate vicinity, and probably never will make much. They present, nevertheless, a sufficiently clear and able exposition of a state of mind on religious subjects by no means peculiar to the Author, but common to a large number of religious and inquiring laymen throughout the country, who, like him, still continue attached to Orthodox churches, though they have renounced Orthodoxy itself, and are feeling about, with such helps as they can command, to find some other and better foundation of trust. The volume is interesting and valuable, therefore, as indicating a change which is everywhere passing over intelligent and active minds among the Orthodox, not professionally fettered, and the direction which this change is beginning to take ; and it is chiefly on this account, that we are led to notice it so much at length in this journal.

The plan here pursued in the discussion of the *Christian Evidences*, though not new, differs from the common one. Most writers on this subject have availed themselves of whatever assistance they supposed might be derived to our faith, from Natural Religion and man's moral constitution. Butler, Locke, Hartley, Clarke, Priestley (who professes to have derived most of his principles on the subject from Hartley), Jenyns, Paley, and very lately Lord Brougham, have all considered the cause of revealed religion to be strongly corroborated by what we know of God and duty by the light of nature. Our author finds this ground preoccupied by the Deists. Here they have entrenched themselves, and here they have erected their batteries against Christianity. They say, that revelation cannot be true, because it contains things which are inconsistent with the moral attributes of God, and the immutable distinctions of moral propriety established in the mind of man. Before any progress can be made in demonstrating the truth of Christianity, these assailants must

be dislodged and discomfited. And this he attempts to do, not by reconciling with what are called the principles of Natural Theology and the moral sense, those parts of the Scriptures to which the Deists object as being inconsistent with them, but by annihilating the ground on which they stand, and utterly denying that Natural Religion teaches us any thing with regard to God's *moral* attributes, and that our own moral constitution is any criterion by which to judge of the propriety or impropriety of the acts of the Deity. To this purpose more than a hundred pages are devoted before he proceeds to the direct proof. This he rests entirely on the credibility of the sacred writers as witnesses of a supernatural interposition to enlighten mankind. From the Scriptures, and from the Scriptures alone, he thinks, do we derive any evidence of the moral attributes of the Deity, and from them alone do we derive any moral distinctions, which are of sufficient authority to be applied as a test to the propriety of his moral actions. Whether he has done wisely in thus thinking to annihilate Natural Religion, the reader must judge.

Our Author begins by observing :

"Now before we can undertake to estimate the truth or falsehood of Christianity, it is of essential importance, that we first ascertain the actual value of the principles by which we are to make our decision. In other words we must accurately determine the following particulars :

"What is the actual amount of knowledge, that we derive from the study of Natural Theology ?

"What is the actual value of those principles, that constitute the Theory of Natural Religion ?

"What is the true theory of Moral Distinctions, *i. e.* what is it that makes one action to be right and another wrong ?

"What is it that constitutes a man a credible witness, and what is it that makes us mistrust and reject the testimony of another ?" — p. 24.

He then proceeds to estimate the value of the dogmas, as he calls them, which constitute Natural Religion.

"Our actual knowledge concerning the origin of religious dogmas, may be stated in a few words. The past history of mankind, exclusive of the Bible, does not communicate to us any information, how the theory of religious obligation has originated. The most ancient records of human transactions, in every instance, exhibit mankind as then living under the influence of religious

institutions, and the latest discoveries of modern enterprise, in hitherto unexplored regions of the earth, inform us of a similar religious condition of things, with every newly discovered nation. Hence it seems to be incontestable, that no nation, or people, have ever yet been discovered, who were destitute of the theory of religious obligation, and of which the following are the essential dogmas.

"1st. That there are gods, creators, and governors of the world, who rule all things, with both general and particular providence.

"2d. That all men are responsible beings before the gods, and accountable for their actions.

"3d. That the soul of man is immortal, and that, after the death of the body, it shall exist in either happiness or misery, according to the manner they may have lived in the present life."

. . . . . "Instead of speculating how these dogmas originated among men, we shall alone inquire into the value of the proofs or arguments by which they are sustained." — p. 29.

These dogmas, to our great surprise, our Author, with the exception of the first, finds altogether unsupported by the appearances of the universe. After a labored discussion he comes to these conclusions concerning them, to our mind, we must confess, most extraordinary.

"1st. That our universe, and all it contains, is the production of intelligent power, but whether of one or more gods we cannot determine.

"2d. Of this god, or gods, we have not the smallest idea, except that he, or they, possess great power and intelligence; and it may be important to add, we are altogether unable to discern their possession of excellent attributes, such as benevolence, mercy, justice, &c.

"3d. We are unable to perceive, that the moral affairs of human life are superintended by any particular providence, and that universal experience opposes such a notion.

"4th. That there is not only no proof, but on the contrary it is against all fact, and the evidence of our senses, to believe that the intelligent principle of man is immortal, and consequently we have not the smallest reason to justify the theory of future reward or punishment. — p. 73.

Of these striking conclusions we have space to examine but one, and that is the proof of the Divine benevolence. This, every one must perceive, depends on the apparent predominance of happiness or misery, in those beings that are made capable of both.

"Now," says our author, "with respect to mankind, there can be no dispute, that human life is so much embittered by sorrow, affliction, and pain, so much by tyranny and oppression, so much by poverty and disease, that, in all ages, every moral writer whatever has exhibited human nature as being essentially unhappy; and death, however much we dread his approach, has ever been regarded as our great deliverer from the troubles of human life. The Scriptures decidedly take the same view, and, in short, none but certain advocates of natural theology, hold any other language on the question of fact." . . . . "As he (God) is, by his visible works, possessed of infinite power and intelligence, so, as he has not appointed a happy state and condition to human existence, it follows that we have no reason whatever to consider him good, from any view derivable from our experience of his providence." — pp. 46, 47.

He also contends, that, "with respect to the brute animals, a stronger position against the theory of the divine goodness may be sustained." And, in another place, he thus concludes; "If a man will have a positive dogma on the subject of the nature and attributes of the Creator, he can come to no other conclusion, reasoning only from nature and experience, than that the Deity was totally indifferent to human and animal happiness."

The facts here assumed, it will be perceived, rest entirely on individual opinion, an opinion which we confess we had never before either seen or heard expressed, except it may be in some moment of great suffering or passionate grief. The conclusions, then, which are drawn from them, will be satisfactory only to those, and we cannot help hoping they will be but a small number, who coincide with him in this opinion. But, supposing it proved that the Creator is "totally indifferent" to the happiness of his creatures, and man especially, — nay, more than this, that suffering actually preponderates, and, therefore, as our author has cut off all consideration of any compensation in a future state, that the balance inclines rather to the side of his malevolence; — this being proved, we seriously would inquire, if the foundations of revelation as well as natural religion be not equally shaken. It immediately establishes a presumption against a revelation. If God be "totally indifferent" to human welfare, it becomes improbable that he would make a revelation at all, if its purpose be to do man good; — much more, if he be in any degree malevolent. Besides, unless you consider the goodness of the Deity, and

his care for human happiness, to be proved by the light of nature, how can you possibly prove the truth of revelation; — we do not here mean that it is a revelation, but that what is revealed is *true*? *You can place no dependence on the divine veracity.* Veracity is certainly a moral attribute; and our author denies, that we can know any thing of the moral attributes of God by the light of nature. Veracity, moreover, in this case is blended with the divine goodness, and that, he says, has no evidence in nature. A God whose moral attributes are by supposition unknown, and who is “indifferent” to the happiness of mankind, would be quite as likely to deceive them in a revelation, as to create them in a condition “essentially unhappy.” Are we told that the Scriptures assert that God is true, and therefore his veracity may be proved from them? We answer, that this assertion makes a part of that very revelation, the truth of which cannot be proved, except by assuming as proved or made probable from some other source, that God himself is true. It is to be feared then, we think, that our author has made too great a sacrifice in order to silence the infidel objections derived from natural religion. *In giving up the moral attributes of the Deity as being antecedently unknown, and undiscoverable by the light of nature, he has abandoned the only ground on which revelation itself can be defended.*

Our author next proceeds to dispose of the objections brought by the Deists against the Scriptures, from what they call the immutability of moral distinctions. They say that the God of the Scriptures is represented in the Scriptures to have done this and that, which contradict our ideas of moral propriety, and therefore they are to be rejected as coming from him. This objection, which is similar to the last, he disposes of in much the same manner. He meets it by saying, that our ideas of moral propriety are relative only to ourselves, and totally inapplicable to the Deity; and therefore we have no right to say that any thing whatever which has been done, or is said to have been done by him, is either right or wrong. He sums up the argument in the following manner.

“Then all that we claim for Christianity is, that it shall not be supposed condemnable for any statement it has made concerning Jehovah, or his proceeding with mankind, on the very intelligible ground, that we know nothing whatever concerning his nature and

attributes." . . . . "Every attempt to estimate the morality of God's act, by what is called the immutability of moral distinctions, has never failed in a single instance to end in error, folly, and mischief." . . . . "All that moralists have ever written on the subject of moral obligations, extends to no system more universal than is embraced by the word Philanthropy. Virtue and morality, justice, right, &c., are mere synonymes with philanthropy, and it is impossible for us to give them any other universality." — pp. 103, 92, 91.

We shall attempt briefly to examine the correctness of these positions. In the first place we observe, that they take for granted the truth of a hypothesis, which, to say the most, has as yet gained but few suffrages, and which seems to us to be positively false ; namely, that utility is not only the foundation of morality, and the safe and proper one for men to adopt when they come to years of discretion ; but that it is constituted the standard in the human mind from the first, — the first and only criterion by which the mind judges any act to be right or wrong. This, we repeat, we do not believe to be a fact. Of this every human being is a sufficient judge. He has only to ask himself, if to perceive any action to be calculated to promote the enjoyment of another, be the same as to perceive it to be right ? Is not the simple perception of right and wrong in the mind long antecedent to the complex perception of an action's being calculated to produce good on the whole ? Does not the child's consciousness of the criminality of lying, long precede his knowledge of the social evils, which at length grow out of it ?

Benevolence or philanthropy, so far from being the supreme authority of the mind, and the standard of action, is no authority at all. It is a motive, an affection, and belongs rather to the heart than the mind. It has a power above it, to which it is subjected, instead of reigning supreme, — this very sense of right and wrong. And we have no other evidence that it is good to be benevolent, except this very sense of right and wrong, which assures us that benevolence is right and malevolence is wrong. It is not a fact then, that all moral principle can be resolved into philanthropy. That God has so constituted the moral sense, that its instinctive judgments shall coincide with the greatest good of the human race, we do not deny. Such an ordination corresponds to that wisdom which forms the embryo bird or fish for the

element in which it is afterward to live. But that the perception of that good is the ground and constituent element of the moral sense, we utterly deny.

Whether right and wrong can be made universals or not, or whether they must be confined to the transactions and relations between man and man, will appear, if we analyze the ideas contained in this distinction, and consider what they imply. They imply an agent, with perception, choice, power, intention, and some sentient being to suffer or enjoy. Now, for one being to destroy the happiness of another being when innocent, strikes our minds as unjust, morally wrong. We know of no exception to this. The idea that it is wrong and unjust to make an innocent being miserable, on the whole, is as self-evident as that two and two make four. And it makes no difference whether the agent be God or man. It is impossible for us to view it in any other light. The circumstances of absolute property, and resistless power, make no difference. Might cannot make right, in the divine, any more than it can in human governments. Let the case but fairly be made out, and the mind decides as promptly in the one case as in the other.

It would not be a satisfactory answer then to the Deist, nor a fair one, when he objects that there are things in the Bible represented to have been done by the Deity which cannot be reconciled with our moral sense, to say that we know nothing as to what would be right or wrong in the Divine conduct. Our author's argument covers every possible supposition, and must be equally good in every supposable case. No matter what tissue of moral obliquity a revelation may charge upon God, it is all the same. He gives, then, the Deist, all he asks; a case utterly irreconcilable. All we can say then is, that the matter is brought to this dilemma, supposing such an indisputable case can be found in the Scriptures;—either that the God of the Scriptures is not good, or that the revelation does not come from him. Take the latter alternative, and its authority is gone of course. Take the former, and it is equally destroyed; for a revelation from a Being not good, can have no claim to our trust. Is it said that these Scriptures *assert* that he is good, and their assertion must be emphatically received as true? We answer, if they contain records of transactions on his part utterly irreconcilable with goodness, as the Deists affirm, and our

author supposes possible, then they likewise assert or imply that he is *not* good, and so contradict themselves, and thus neutralize their own authority.

Unless there be some fallacy in the preceding arguments, we fear we shall be compelled to conclude that the Deist's hands would be strengthened, instead of being palsied, by the proposed annihilation and abandonment of natural religion, and the denial of the applicability of moral distinctions to the Deity. And, if this be the case, we see not how we can avoid the conclusion, that the first hundred pages of the book have carried the author to a greater distance from his object, than he was when he commenced.

The next two chapters relate to the nature of the evidence by which the Scriptures are sustained as a Divine revelation. This he considers to rest on one point, the *credibility* of the writers. "In conformity with opinions already announced on a preceding page, I reiterate the belief, that the only sure argument upon which we can receive the Christian religion as a Divine institution, depends upon the absolute credibility of the biblical writers. If we can prove them absolutely free from every imputation of knavery and fraud, I cannot see how their testimony can be rejected."

There is much valuable matter in these chapters, particularly on the subject of miracles. We have never seen this subject yet set in its true and proper light. "Since a past miracle can have no argument or demonstration of its truth embodied in itself, but is absolutely dependent on historic relation, I apprehend they cannot in themselves be brought forward as matters of evidence to us at the present day. Their whole force, as divine evidence, appears to have been exhausted on the eye-witnesses." And yet we suppose the writer would agree with the Apostle, that, if Christ be not risen, our faith is vain, and Christianity a delusion. What ground then do they occupy? We confess we have never seen this subject thoroughly investigated. We are disposed, however, to give "credibility" of the witnesses a much wider signification than our author. He makes it to rest exclusively on their honesty and disinterestedness. We apprehend that he has confounded two things here, which it is necessary to keep distinct; because the mind always does so in weighing testimony. This distinction is between the credibility of the witnesses, and the credibility of the facts to which they

testify, as supported by their testimony. This latter depends, in a great measure, on the nature of the facts themselves, their antecedent probability, their consistency with the known laws of nature, and with each other. Thus, when we read the testimonies of the Apostles concerning Christ, we do not look solely at the apparent sincerity and honesty which they exhibit, but likewise at the intrinsic probability and consistency of their narrative. We cannot keep out of our mind the probability or improbability of God's making a revelation at all, at such a time and such a place, the character of Christ and his religion, and other particulars of the same general description. These are considerations, which we cannot possibly separate from our estimate of the credibility of the facts, even if we would. When, therefore, our author asserts, that he rests the truth of Christianity on the honesty and disinterestedness of the witnesses, he must be understood as expressing only an individual opinion, stating merely what seems the strong point to *him*.

And this leads us to express a conviction long entertained, and which this publication has contributed to strengthen, of the almost entire inutility of one man's writing books of Evidences for another, and almost, indeed, of writing books of Evidences at all. The evidences are plainly cumulative in their nature, and are most convincing, when viewed by the mind at once, and are rather weakened when separately discussed. Bacon's censure of the Schoolmen applies here with the greatest force. "*Questionum minutiis scientiarum frangunt soliditatem.*" "Considered as a whole," he proceeds to say, "like the fabled Scylla, it seems beautiful and specious; but when you descend into distinctions, it ends in monstrous altercations and barking questions."

One argument strikes one, and another another. More than a hundred years ago, Locke wrote a book to show that Christianity was to be believed because it is reasonable. A half-century later Soame Jenyns wrote another, to show that it is to be believed because it is unreasonable, so utterly contradictory to the principles of the human understanding, that the mind of man could never have invented it. Lord Brougham, on the other side of the Atlantic, publishes a book in which he asserts, that miracles even cannot substantiate a revelation which contradicts the principles of Natural Religion. Almost simultaneously a book comes out in America,

which annihilates Natural Religion altogether, and denies that it has a single dogma of sufficient certainty to form a criterion by which to judge of the claims of a revelation. It is plain, that no progress can be made in this way in the conviction of skeptics. They have only to set the different defenders of the cause to quarrelling with each other, and thus neutralize their authority. Let each state his own grounds, but let him not attempt to invalidate the arguments of the other. Let them do so, and this very fact, that there are so many independent minds, convinced by independent arguments, will show the richness and variety of the evidence, and thus demonstrate, that, when aggregated instead of divided, it must be absolutely overwhelming.

The Bible, if it be from God, we may be sure, addresses men in the best possible manner; and if it does not convince them, just as it is, it must arise from some mental or moral obliquity, which argumentation will be the last thing to cure. And, paradoxical as it may seem, we believe that discourses on the Evidences are generally among the most useless which fall from our pulpits, even in congregations where doubt is most prevalent. They suggest two objections where they answer one, and are almost always found, in the end, to unsettle many more minds than they confirm.

We do not, of course, mean to say, that there is any deficiency in the evidence by which revelation is supported; we speak merely of the mode and need of its formal exhibition and examination. "*The whole need not a physician, but those that are sick.*" As for those whose faith has been disturbed by deistical books or arguments, they may be occasionally benefited by books of Evidences. Still we believe the great battle is fought over the sacred pages, with very little foreign aid. The process through which the commonest mind passes, is strictly philosophical; quite as much so, as if guided by the greatest masters of formal logic. It is, we believe, something like this. "Here is a book *unique* in every particular. Its doctrines concerning the Divine Nature are immeasurably more pure and exalted, than those of any other book or system of religion that the world has else exhibited. Its doctrines concerning our moral and spiritual nature find a witness in the inner man, of their truth. Humanity, under its auspices, rises to a purity, strength, perfection, and happiness, unimagined even by the human mind without it. The God

which it reveals is the same God we see in nature, and is represented to have interrupted the laws of nature in order to give man evidence of his interposition, in a manner not unsuited to the dignity and benevolence of his character. We see, moreover, in the character of Christ, a moral miracle, quite as striking as any change in the physical universe could be. These are actual facts, phenomena, presented to the mind for its explanation. It must have some theory of their origin. Which is the most probable, revelation or fiction?" Now we aver, that no book ever has exhibited, or ever can exhibit these considerations with the force, and comprehensiveness, and concentration, with which they are presented by the Bible itself. The famous treatise of Dr. Paley, concerning "the labors, dangers, and sufferings of the Apostles," as utterly fails of bringing before the mind the broad and general grounds of belief in Christianity, as a narrow arm of the sea fails of exhibiting the vastness and depth of the ocean. We doubt whether one reader in ten of that book ever thought of resting his faith on that individual point, on which he lays the whole stress.

The most substantial and valuable part of this book is the chapters on the constitution of the Jewish church and state. Much of this is certainly new and very ably handled. The author shows conclusively, from the independence of the orders of the Priests, the Prophets, and the Kings on each other, that there is absolutely no room for suspicion of collusion and fraud. We commend these chapters to all thinking men, and especially to the clergy, as containing much that will strike them as fresh and valuable.

Our readers will be curious, we suppose, to know what our author, having proved the truth of revelation, considers it to teach. This division, on *Doctrines*, though not the most important, is certainly the most curious part of the work. If the opinions there expressed may be considered, and we are inclined to think they may be, as the index of progress of mind on these subjects in this country among men of information, they lead us to some gratifying conclusions. The position occupied by our author may be pretty well calculated, when we say, that he discards the doctrines of Original Sin and the Trinity. Indeed, we have never seen the doctrine of Original Sin more lucidly and ably refuted.

"That all men," he says, "without exception, are more or less sinful in their lives before Jehovah, arises not from any inherent taint or corruption, such as is imagined by the theory of Original Sin, but from the fact that we are intellectual and moral beings of an imperfect constitution, undergoing a probationary discipline before him as free agents. As such, exercised on the perfect law of Jehovah, we sometimes do right, and sometimes we do wrong. How could it be otherwise? The very theory of our probation anticipates our disobedience as well as our obedience. What else could be expected of free agents under trial? If any man could keep the law of Jehovah perfectly, he is a perfect being, and no longer in an imperfect condition." — p. 271.

"If Adam and Eve fell without any taint of Original Sin, why should our transgressions be considered a proof of the existence of Original Sin in us? Adam and Eve's transgression was not less in its moral obliquity than any of our offences. If they therefore sinned without Original Sin, it never can be inferred that our transgressions proceed from that source." — p. 267.

"With this plain exhibition of the fallacy of the doctrine of Original Sin, I apprehend that we are not required to discourse at large upon predestination, election, effectual calling, perseverance of the saints, and sundry other doctrines growing out of the theory of Original Sin. These all fall together by the exposition we have made above; for they are not taught in the Scriptures, and are but doctrines of men made through unjustifiable inferences." — pp. 274, 275.

On the doctrine of the Trinity he is equally explicit. Though he refuses to speculate, he rejects this doctrine as not contained in Scripture.

"Nothing can be clearer, nor more distinctly expressed in the Scripture, than that God, meaning thereby Jehovah, is one. — THERE IS BUT ONE GOD. — This is also the doctrine of the Trinitarians; there is but one God, though there are three persons in the Godhead.

"But, do the Scriptures anywhere use the word *Trinity*? Do the Scriptures anywhere say, there are three persons in the Godhead? No, not in a single text, for the oft-quoted passage of 1 John v. 7, has been, long since, shown to be a corruption, and is admitted to be so by all the more eminent critics of the present day.

"The doctrine of the Trinity, then, is one which men have inferred from the Scripture writings, and is not a doctrine of formal revelation." — p. 278.

A person, who had been accustomed to divide the Christian world into two classes, Unitarians and Trinitarians, would have no hesitation, we imagine, in placing the writer of the above in the former class, but in the following paragraphs he would find himself corrected.

“But if the doctrine of the Trinitarians be presumptuous and contrary to the exhibition of the Scripture writings, what must we say of that of the Socinians or modern Unitarians? I am at a loss how to express myself upon this subject; on the one hand they profess to found their belief on the Scriptures, and largely quote it to prove their doctrine. On the other hand, as I understand the Scriptures, I have no hesitation in stating my opinion, that their expositions and doctrine, in its important features, are directly contrary to the whole scope and tenor of the Scripture writings. I have no right to impugn the honesty or sincerity of the Socinians, but I am perfectly at a loss how to reconcile their opinions with the Scriptures. Judging by the light of my own understanding and conscience, I do consider the doctrines of modern Unitarians to be entirely subversive of the Christian religion, so far as I can comprehend the subject; and, this being the case, I will not hesitate to bear my testimony against such opinions. If the Scriptures do teach us, and I am clear on this point, that salvation from our sins is only to be attained through the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ, and in virtue of that intercession that he makes continually with the Father for us, so I cannot consider the Unitarian doctrine other than an absolute departure from the theory of the Scriptures, and a formal rejection of that salvation which God has freely offered to us. To reject the mode that God has appointed, leaves no alternative and no hope. What then shall the end of this be?

“In the course of a very general reading upon the moral and religious speculations of men, I have been often disturbed by the extreme difference that sometimes existed between their views and my own, but with none have I been so much disposed to lose patience as with the Socinian writings. The excellent Archbishop Tillotson, on one occasion, speaks of Socinus as ‘a great master of reason,’ and which I shall concede to be the fact from such commendation, for I have never seen his works; but I defy any other sect of Christians, except the Unitarians, to read the works of Priestly [Priestley], of Belsham, Evanson, and other of their champions, without being amazed at their reasons, and shocked with their apparent presumption.

“But though I consider the Trinitarian doctrine to want Scriptural authority, and that of the Socinians to be altogether con-

tradictory to the Scriptures, I cannot advocate the hypothesis of the Arians. I cannot but consider it presumptuous to determine so incomprehensible a subject according to any hypothesis." — pp. 280, 281.

We had hitherto supposed that all possible opinions concerning the nature and dignity of Christ were comprehended under the three denominations of Unitarian, Arian (which is in reality Unitarian), and Trinitarian. But here is attempted, not a *tertium*, but a *quartum quid*, irreducible to any known category, because undefined. How far it may be possible for a human mind to think of Christ at all without assigning him any specific rank in the universe, we shall not assume the province of determining. If we examine the thing a little closer, we shall find that our author has a greater dread of heretical *names* than heretical sentiments. For, while he denies the Trinity, he denounces the Unitarians; and, while he disclaims the name of Arian, he hesitates not to advance Arian opinions, for in one place he expresses himself thus; — "Jesus Christ, whom he of his infinite mercy sent into the world from a state of preëxisting glory, that we might be saved from our sins." Now how a man, who entertains such an opinion, can be other than an Arian of some species, as that term is commonly received, we confess ourselves unable to see. And, what is still more surprising, in advancing this sentiment we find him treading the very ground which he has forbidden to others, founding doctrines on inferences. It is nowhere expressly asserted that Christ existed in a previous state of glory. Robert Hall, one of the most able, earnest, and, we may add, bitter advocates of the doctrine of the Trinity, admits that it is merely a doctrine of inference, except in one passage, — "Before Abraham was, I am," — and this passage, when examined, will be found to have quite as great ambiguity as the rest. It does not positively assert that Christ existed before Abraham, because the verb is in the present tense. It may not be a verb of existence at all, but only of affirmation, and used, just as it is in other cases, with the ellipsis of *he*, or the *Messiah*; as when he says, "If ye believe not that I am, ye shall die in your sins;" that is, "that I am *he*," or the *Messiah*. It may mean, therefore, according to the current use of language in the Scriptures, that Jesus was personally promised, or designated in the counsels of Jehovah, as the *Messiah*, before the days of Abraham.

Biblical criticism is not a subject with which we have a right to expect a layman to be intimately acquainted. From the specimens we have of it in this book, we should hardly suppose the author to have examined this subject with sufficient accuracy to justify a positive, not to say, dogmatic opinion upon it. For in the very paragraph, in which he speaks of the preëxistent glory of Christ, he quotes the Scripture as saying, "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the Lord Jesus Christ." The words of Scripture are, "the man Christ Jesus." Another passage he quotes as bearing decisively on this subject. "*Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend unto heaven? that is, to bring Christ down from above; or, Who shall descend into the deep? that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.*" Deeper investigation would have convinced him, according to the opinion of the best commentators, that Christ is here, by a common metonymy, put for his doctrine or religion.

Of the facility with which *he* likewise can draw unauthorized inferences from the Scriptures, we have still further proof in this very passage. He goes on to quote. "*But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.*" In other words Paul observes, 'Do not concern yourselves how Christ descended from heaven, nor how he again ascended to his glory; believe the fact, that he did descend, and that he again ascended with power sufficient to save as many as shall call upon him.'" Now we affirm, that, in this very passage, St. Paul makes saving faith to comprehend no such article as the descent of Christ from heaven, or from a state of preëxistent glory. The only essential article is his resurrection from the dead, — "*and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.*" Will not this, we ask, comprehend the simplest form of Unitarianism?

This brings us to our last topic, his denunciation of the Unitarians and his reasons for it. It cannot be certainly for the main article of their creed, that from which they derive their name, — their maintenance of the simple unity of God in opposition to a Trinity; for in that opinion he coincides. And, by so doing, he must subject himself to the bitter revil-

ings, which that sect suffers on all sides. Those who maintain the Trinity, he must be aware, consider that between them and all others, there is a great gulf fixed. But our author, though a Unitarian in some sense, is sure that he is on the safe side of the gulf, and that that gulf is not the Trinity, but the Atonement. "If the Scriptures do teach us, and I am clear on this point, that salvation from our sins is only to be attained through the sacrificial death of Christ, and in virtue of that intercession that he makes continually with the Father for us, so I cannot consider the Unitarian doctrine other than an absolute departure from the theory of the Scriptures, and a formal rejection of that salvation, which God has freely offered to us. To reject the mode that God has appointed, leaves no alternative and no hope."

We cannot but be astonished at the rashness with which charges so grave are made, and a doom so dreadful is denounced, upon specifications so exceedingly vague and indefinite. Such is the extreme ambiguity of the language used in this passage, such the number of distinct propositions which it may contain, the denial of either of which may be fraught with unutterable peril, that we must examine them in detail. "Salvation from our sins is only to be attained through the sacrificial death and intercession of Christ" may mean, in the first place, that our past sins could not have been pardoned on repentance, had they not been expiated by Christ; or it may mean, that our deliverance from the dominion and practice of sin can be accomplished only by those divine aids which were purchased by his death; or it may mean simply, that Christ sacrificed his life to persuade men to renounce sin. It may mean that sincere repentance, and all other acts and exercises of a religious man, are inefficacious and unacceptable unless accompanied by this specific element of belief, that the death of Christ was sacrificial and expiatory. Now, in the denial of which of all these possible meanings of this allegation, lies the deadly delinquency of the Unitarians? Suppose it to lie in the last, which on the whole, is more probable, we ask if it be either reasonable or scriptural to suppose, that a sincere penitent Christian man must inevitably be lost, because he does not look on the death of Christ as sacrificial and propitiatory? If the death of Christ be propitiatory and expiatory, it must be so independently of human belief or unbelief. It is a transaction finished and completed ages ago. If it was in-

tended to produce an effect on God to remove any obstacle in him or in his law, that obstacle has been removed. The only fact, in which practical faith can be at all interested, is the fact, that God is now ready to pardon sin on sincere repentance. The practical point is the readiness, not the manner in which it has been brought about. There is no greater inducement to repentance and obedience, on the supposition that Christ died to produce that readiness, than on the supposition that he died to give mankind assurance of it. And, even admitting the sacrificial and expiatory nature of Christ's death to be true, it cannot be proved that even those who fail to recognise it as such, are to be shut out from the benefits of it, unless it can be shown from the Scriptures that God has specified this element of faith in Christ, that his death was sacrificial and propitiatory, as indispensable, superadded to all other requirements. The matter then is reduced to a question of fact, Has he made such a requirement? We affirm that he has not. And instead of running over all the texts of Scripture on this subject, we shall recur to the author's own view of atonement and saving faith, which he has formally summed up, a mode of proceeding which ought certainly to be satisfactory to him. "*If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.*" Here is the fundamental and all-comprehending article of Christian faith according to our author, but not one word in it of the sacrificial and expiatory nature of the death of Christ. We do not say too much, then, when we affirm, that he is not only narrowly bigoted, but grossly inconsistent, in condemning Unitarians as lost.

But the ambiguities of this unsparing condemnation are not yet exhausted. A sentence of so grave a nature as inevitable perdition, one would suppose, ought to rest on charges most specific in their statement, and most explicitly made out. "To reject the mode that God has appointed leaves no alternative and no hope." The most natural meaning of *reject*, is to refuse to accept, to refuse to act upon or avail one's self of any thing. Now it does not appear, according to our author's own showing, that the death of Christ, as far as it was sacrificial, has ever been offered to man either for his acceptance or rejection. God, to whom it was addressed, has already accepted it. Man can accept or reject only what is offered

to him. Not the alternative of believing or not believing, that the death of Christ was sacrificial, is offered to man, but of accepting or not accepting the mercy of God thus procured, on condition of true repentance and sincere obedience. And do Unitarians reject the mode which God has appointed in this sense? As far as human judgment is concerned, their lives and characters must answer. If their lives and characters will not suffer by a comparison with the mass of their fellow Christians of other denominations, if their faith in Christ, evinced by their reception of his revelation as the word of God, and worshipping the Father in his name, and, in the midst of persecution and reproach, building temples for the inculcation of his religion, has the power to purify the heart and overcome the world, we know of no sense, except one of the most narrow and irrational bigotry, in which they can be said to reject the mode of salvation which God has offered. Of all men, we should suppose, that our Author ought to beware of wholesale denunciations for mere shades of faith, after such tremendous departures from Orthodoxy as he avows in this book. He must be aware that he

“but teaches  
Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return  
To plague the inventor.”

He must be aware, that, if he establishes the principle that a precisely accurate faith as to the nature of the Atonement be necessary to salvation, the great mass of Christians may mourn over him as quite as liable to damnation, quite as guilty of “rejecting the only mode that God has offered,” in failing to recognise the infinite nature of the Victim, as the Unitarians are in failing to perceive that the death of Christ was literally an expiatory sacrifice. Further and more enlarged investigations, we are sure, would convince him that the nature of the Atonement is such, that, among those who believe the fundamental proposition, which he himself has laid down as the corner-stone, the resurrection of Christ, the only fatal heresy is a wicked, irreligious life; that Atonement is a practical, not a speculative subject, reconciliation to God by repentance and reformation, “when by wicked works we were enemies to him;” and that every man receives the benefits of it just so far as he, by a religious life, enjoys peace with God, and the testimony of a good conscience.

His violent prejudices against the Unitarians seem principally to have been excited, not by the general doctrines of the sect, but by some particular passages or statements of some of their champions, such as Priestley, Evanson, and Belsham. He ought to be sure, that the whole denomination participate in those obnoxious sentiments, before he condemns them in a body. Priestley, though one of the greatest men, and one of the sincerest and humblest Christians, who have ever lived, mingled with his religious opinions some philosophical dogmas, which have no more connexion with those opinions than with any other creed, — materialism and philosophical necessity, — dogmas, which, whether true or false, cannot but be chilling and revolting to the great mass of mankind, and would be sufficient, we fear, to sink any religious system, however true, to which they might be attached. He has, besides, on religious topics, advanced some sentiments, and adopted some modes of expression, for which it would be altogether unjust to make all who are denominated Unitarians responsible. The head and front of Evanson's offending consists in having collected and arranged the facts, that altogether annihilate the doctrine of verbal inspiration, which was so long and so obstinately maintained, but which all, who have any tolerable acquaintance with the subject, now perceive it to be necessary to abandon, in order to sustain the divine authority of the Scriptures. And we are sorry to see men, high in place, disingenuous enough, in order to excite horror against the sect among the common people, to criminate the Unitarians, and join in the outcry against them for advocating a theory which they know to be true, and without which they know that inspiration of any kind cannot be sustained for a moment. Mr. Belsham may have been unfortunate in his modes of expression, and extravagant in some of his positions, and may have shocked some even of his own denomination, as well as many out of it; but we believe, that those, who follow in his steps of patient, careful, learned investigation, will always find it more easy to be shocked with his presumption, than to answer his arguments.

One word more on the use of names. It is a standing maxim of the low morality of the world, that "all is fair in politics." Would that we could say that the same principle is not acted upon, though not avowed, in polemical discussion, and in the tactics of sectarian struggle. Here we have a gen-

tleman, who maintains the character of high moral worth, and who would scorn to utter a slander or a base insinuation of any kind; and yet we find him applying the name "Socinian" to a large body of professed disciples of Christ, without even, according to his own confession, having read the works of Socinus, or knowing of course, what his peculiar opinions were, or whether there was any coincidence between them and the opinions of modern Unitarians. But he *did* know, that the Unitarians of the present day disclaim that name, and that the word *Socinian* has been for centuries a nucleus of all evil and hateful associations, which, in the minds of many, may be said instantly to defile and pollute any thing to which it is applied.

To use our author's language, there is nothing with which we are so apt to lose patience, as with the moral obliquity and fraud, which are exhibited in the pulpits of this land every Sabbath day. We see men stand up there as the advocates of justice and righteousness, truth and honesty, and, in the same breath, couple together, in one sweeping anathema, Atheists, Infidels, and Unitarians. Do they not know, that the impression they make upon their uninformed hearers is slanderous and false? Do they not know, that they are doing what in civil affairs would be an indictable offence, and be followed by prosecution, and the loss of moral character and all honorable reputation? Do they not feel the gross injustice, the cruel wrong, which they do their brethren, when, to excite odium against them, they class them with the deniers of a God, and the rejecters of all revelation;—men, who worship God and revere the Saviour, and who labor, according to their own views of truth and duty, to build up his cause? However the Unitarians may fall behind their opponents in professions of piety, we hope that they may never be left to fall so low in point of morality, as to endeavour to throw odium on their adversaries by invidious names and slanderous classifications.

G. W. B.

---

[For the Christian Examiner.]

ART. IV.—*The "Angel of Jehovah," mentioned in the Old Testament, not identical with the Messiah; being the Conclusion of the Article on the "Deity of the Messiah not a Doctrine of the Old Testament."\**

WE have seen, in the last Number of this journal, that there is no evidence, that the Angel of Jehovah was represented in the Old Testament as a person distinct from Jehovah, and yet the same being with him; and that there is no evidence that any of the Jews at any period ever entertained such a notion. We now come to the second proposition, which is necessary to be established before any one can prove the Deity of the Messiah from the manner in which the Angel of Jehovah is spoken of in the Old Testament, even though the first had been proved to be true. The Deity of the Messiah cannot be proved from those passages unless his identity with the Angel of Jehovah be also established, even though the view of Hengstenberg in regard to the relation of the Angel to Jehovah be right, and ours wrong.

What then is the evidence that the Angel of Jehovah was regarded as identical with the Messiah? In regard to this point, Hengstenberg is supported by some Unitarian writers; by some who regard the angel in question as a created or derived angel; especially by Henry Taylor in his celebrated "Ben Mordecai's Letters."

And here, too, we must remark, in regard to the evidence which might be expected for the second proposition, if it were true,—It is a strange proposition. That the Messiah, whom the prophets set forth as a child, that was to be born, and that was to grow up from small beginnings, that was to be a descendant of David, &c., was the very angel, that appeared to Abraham, Moses, Gideon, &c., is so very extraordinary a proposition, that it is reasonable to require very substantial evidence in its favor, before we can put faith in it. If the prophets had had any knowledge of so remarkable a fact, it must have occupied an important space in their minds. In speaking of the glory of the Messiah, the brightest feature of

---

\* Christian Examiner, Number LXXIV., for May, 1836, p. 240.

their descriptions would have been, that he was the angel, that had appeared so often for the guidance and deliverance of their fathers.

What, then, is the evidence, which Hengstenberg adduces from the prophets, to show that they believed that the expected Messiah would be identical with the Angel of Jehovah. Never, I believe, was so important a proposition attempted to be proved with less evidence. He adduces only four passages, namely, Malachi iii. 1; Hosea iii. 5; Micah v. 1, and Isaiah ix. 5, compared with Judges xiii. 18; and two of these, namely, those in Hosea and Micah, he introduces with a "perhaps," and those two we have explained in a former article.\*

In Malachi iii. 1, upon which we made some remarks in our former article, the Messiah is mentioned as מְלָאךְ הַבְּרִית, which we suppose to be correctly translated in the common version, "the messenger of the covenant," that is, as most critics of every denomination understand it, the messenger of that new covenant, which Jehovah had promised, Jerem. xxxi. 31, "to make with the house of Israel and the house of Judah." We have seen that the term מְלָאךְ is an official term, used a hundred times to denote a human messenger, and particularly that it was applied to prophets and to priests. But, because the term is also applied to angels, Hengstenberg will have it, that מְלָאךְ הַבְּרִית, in this verse, should be rendered *Angel of the covenant*, in reference to the old covenant given upon Mount Sinai, although nothing is said by Moses about the law being given by an angel, and although the connexion of the passage evidently points to the future new covenant, rather than to the past, and although the prophets often refer to a Messiah, the descendant of David, as an object of desire and expectation, never to an angel. The idea that the Messiah was the mediator of the old covenant is as inconsistent with the whole tenor of the New Testament,† as of the Old.

The other passage adduced by Hengstenberg to prove the identity of the Messiah with the angel that appeared to the patriarchs, is, if possible, weaker still. Isaiah, in chapter ix. 5, gives to the Messiah the appellation *wonderful*. But in Judges xiii. 18, the angel is represented as saying, "Why

\* Christian Examiner, Vol. XIX. pp. 296, 297.

† See John i. 17; v. 46; vii. 19; and the Epistles of Paul, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, *passim*.

askest thou after my name, seeing it is Wonderful;" the original terms being the same, מַלְאָךְ, or מְלָאךְ. Who does not see that the term is not a proper name, and that it may be applied to different persons for different reasons. The term is applied to things as well as persons. Because an angel is called wonderful, it surely does not follow, that every wonderful person is an angel; \* much less, the angel mentioned in Judges.

But such reasoning as this is brought to prove the Deity of the Messiah, not only by Hengstenberg, but many others. Indeed no argument is more commonly adduced, in the vicinity of the writer of this article, to prove the Deity of Christ, than one founded on a similar principle. In Isaiah chapter xlv. 21, the Supreme Being is called a Saviour. But, because Jesus Christ is called the Saviour, they will have it, that Jesus Christ must be the Supreme Being, and that Isaiah xlv. affords complete proof of his Deity; forgetting that the same argument will prove Moses, Joshua, Othniel, and a host of others, by whom God saved his people, and who are expressly called Saviours,† to be also the Supreme Being. This argument is insisted on even by President Dwight, in one of his Sermons.

Those two passages, then, together with the two, which he himself regards as doubtful, and which we explained in a former article, are all the evidence which Hengstenberg produces from the Old Testament, to prove the identity of the Messiah that was to be born of a woman at a future day, with the angel that appeared to the patriarchs. What will not one believe, who will believe such a proposition upon such evidence?

Here, too, we might expect the discussion of the second proposition to end. What Hengstenberg undertook was, to prove the Deity of the Messiah from the *Old Testament*. We have examined all the passages he has adduced from it, and shown our readers what they are. It is singular, that he does not confine himself to the Old Testament. To a plain man it will appear very strange, that, if the identity of the angel with the Messiah be a doctrine of the Old Testament, it

---

\* A Jewish comment in Jalcut Simeoni, part 2, fol. 11. 3, (Schoett. I. 924,) is as follows; "The angel said to Manoah, I know not in what shape I am formed; for God changes us every hour. Why then do you ask my name? Sometimes he makes us fire, sometimes wind, sometimes men, and sometimes angels."

† See Nehemiah ix. 27; Judges iii. 9; 2 Kings xiii. 5.

should not be found there clearly revealed. It seems to be a singular procedure to resort even to the New Testament to prove what was revealed to the Jews under the Mosaic dispensation. But, without regard to the applicability of his arguments to the particular proposition which he undertook to prove, let us consider what they are. We will not dwell long upon them, because they have been satisfactorily explained by many writers.

The first is from John i. 11, where it is said of the Logos, "He came to his peculiar possession, and his peculiar people received him not." Without going fully into the explanation of this passage, which has been so often explained by others, it is sufficient to remark, that there is no proof that St. John regarded the Logos as identical with the angel that appeared to the patriarchs, or as identical with the Messiah, though it may have been manifested through him.\*

In John xii. 41, says our Author, Isaiah is said to have seen the glory of Christ and to have spoken of him, alluding to Isaiah chapter vi., where Isaiah saw the glory of Jehovah. A person must have a very contemptible opinion of St. John's understanding or memory, who can suppose that he could have regarded the splendid description of Isaiah's inauguration to his prophetic office by Jehovah as a description of the future Messiah. How much more probable is the opinion, that, when he speaks of seeing *his* glory, he means the glory of God, mentioned in verse 38, and that, by "speaking of him," he means, that the declaration, that the hearts of the Jews would be hardened, was applicable to the times of Christ as well as to the times of the prophet Isaiah.† But, whatever may be the explanation of this passage, it certainly has nothing to do with the proposition it is brought to prove, the identity of the Messiah with an angel, who appeared to the fathers.

The next passage adduced by Hengstenberg, is 1 Cor. x. 9. *Μηδὲ ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστὸν, καθὼς καὶ τινες αὐτῶν ἐπείρασαν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ὀφειῶν ἀπώλοντο.* Our common version correctly renders it, "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted;" that is, evidently, "'tempted' God;" as archbishop Newcome observes, "If we read *Χρίστον*, the sense is, 'Nor

---

\* On the proem of St. John's Gospel, see Norton's "Statement of Reasons," &c. p. 229.

† See Kuinoel upon John xii. 41.

let us tempt, try, prove, provoke, Christ now ; as some of them did God at that time.' "

1 Peter i. 11. The Apostle says concerning the prophets, "searching what, or what manner of time, the *spirit of Christ* which was in them did signify." According to a very common use of the genitive, as the genitive of the object, in the New Testament, "the Spirit of Christ" here denotes the spirit relating to the Messiah, the spirit, that suggested what related to the Messiah, or, as it is expressed or rather explained, in the latter part of the verse, "that testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ." No good reason can be assigned, why "the spirit of Christ" is used here, rather than, as elsewhere, "the spirit," "the holy spirit," or "spirit of God," unless the meaning be as we have stated.

In Hebrews xi. 26, Moses is said to have preferred "the reproach of Christ" to "the treasures of Egypt"; that is, as most interpreters of every name understand it, such reproach as Christ endured. So chapter xiii. 13. "Let us, therefore, go forth to him without the camp, *bearing his reproach*," that is, such as he endured. See also Phil. iii. 10. It may even mean, such reproach as Christians endured ; such reproach, as was connected with the profession of Christianity.

In Hebrews xii. 26, says Hengstenberg, "the voice of Christ at the giving of the law is said to have shaken the earth."

To us it appears, that the opinion that Christ was concerned in the giving of the Mosaic law is wholly inconsistent with the scope of the author's reasoning in this passage, and throughout the Epistle. His constant aim is to show, that God spoke to mankind by a higher instrumentality and a higher mode in relation to the Christian, than to the Jewish dispensation. In the beginning of the Epistle, chapter i. 1, 2, God is represented as the original speaker in both dispensations. "God who spoke . . . . to the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by his son." But, objected the Judaizers, God spoke to the chief of the prophets, Moses, *by angels*, on Mount Sinai. To this the author of the Epistle replies, that the son was superior to angels, and that those, who were disobedient to the voice of God speaking by his son in the Christian dispensation, were exposed to far greater punishment than those, who were disobedient to the same voice, uttered by other instrumentality. See chap. ii. 1, 2 ; x. 28, 29.

In chap. xii. 25, which precedes the verse in question, the writer intends to establish the point, that the Christian religion had higher claims to the regard of men than the Jewish, by representing God as speaking from a *higher scene* in relation to the Christian dispensation, than formerly in relation to the Jewish; that, whereas he had formerly spoken on Mount Sinai, a tangible, gross, material mountain, by angels, he at that time had spoken to them from the spiritual Mount Sion, the heavenly Jerusalem, to which Christians are represented as having come.

We think, then, that throughout the sentence it is God, who is represented as speaking; speaking, agreeably to the language of chap. i. 1, by the Mediator of the new covenant and by the blood of Jesus from the spiritual Mount Sion, as he formerly spoke from Mount Sinai by Moses. "Beware; disregard not him, who speaks; for if they escaped not, who disregarded him speaking upon earth, how much less shall we, who turn away from him speaking from heaven; whose voice then shook," &c.

The figure of God's speaking from heaven is connected with the whole imagery of the passage, which precedes it. Christians are represented as having approached, not a tangible mountain and material objects in this world of sense adapted to produce terror, but to have come to the heavenly Jerusalem.\* "But ye have come to mount Sion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of angels, the solemn convocation and assembly of the first-born, whose names are enrolled in heaven, and to God, who rules over all," &c.

The writer to the Hebrews, after representing Christians as

---

\* The heavenly Jerusalem he might have called, in the language of the Platonists, the archetypal and ideal Jerusalem, the city of God in the ideal world. Philo, after saying that the world (the universe) was the house and city of the first man, adds, "But of this city and commonwealth there must have been some citizens before man, who may with propriety be called metropolitans, it being their lot to inhabit the vast encompassing sphere, and they being enrolled as members of the greatest and most perfect polity. But who can these be except intelligent divine natures, some incorporeal and objects of intellect only, and some not without bodies, as is the case with the stars."—*De Mund. Opif.*, Vol. I. p. 34. For this illustration, and for the translation and the substance of the exposition of the passage, we are immediately indebted to a friend, to whom, as a Teacher of the Art of Interpretation and otherwise, we owe more than can be particularly acknowledged.

having come to the Jerusalem in heaven, consistently with this figure represents God as speaking to them from heaven. The literal meaning, which he connected with God's speaking on earth, and from heaven, may have been, that in the Mosaic dispensation he had taught men what in comparison might be called earthly things, while now, speaking from heaven, he had taught men by Christ spiritual and heavenly things.

Knowing the weakness of his Scriptural proofs in regard to the identity of the angel with the Messiah, Hengstenberg again resorts to Jewish tradition. He endeavours to show that certain Jewish writers expected the angel Metatron to come as the Messiah. It follows from what we have proved respecting the Metatron, that to prove it to be a doctrine of Revelation, that he was identical with the Messiah, would be only to establish one form of Unitarianism. But there is no evidence adduced even from the writings of the Cabalists, that the Metatron was expected to come as the Messiah, or to be incarnate. Before, however, we attend to what is brought forward as evidence of such an opinion, let us inquire what weight it should have with us, in case it were established. Suppose, that in the Talmud, or in the writings of the Cabalists, there should be found evidence, that an exalted angel was expected as the Messiah. What is that to us? Are not those writings full of false opinions relating to the Messiah, and to every other subject? Do they not abound with the most fantastical, puerile notions? Is there no way of accounting for the dreams of the Cabalists, except by supposing them to have been revealed by God to the Jews? Let all, which Dr. Allix, Schoettgen, and others have attempted to prove in relation to Jewish tradition, be granted, still, with the writings of the Old Testament in our hands, and their evidence on the subject being what we have shown it to be, we conceive, that, all that can be extracted from the tales of the Talmud, or the mysteries and fooleries of the Cabala, is entitled to absolutely no weight.

And especially is this the case, when it is not pretended by these writers, that the opinion of the Jewish nation, at the time of our Saviour, is expressed by the writings in question. Could it be proved that the whole Jewish nation believed in the Trinity at the time of our Saviour, and that the Messiah was the angel that appeared to the patriarchs, still, with the

Bible in our hands, and with the sure conclusions, to which correct principles of interpretation lead us, we should have no good reason to believe in such a doctrine. We should rather have reason to say, that the Jews taught "for doctrines the commandments of men." Who, in our community, would take the opinions of the majority of the Christian church at the present day, as evidence of what Christ taught on any important subject? No one, who is not ready to make his submission to the Bishop of Rome.

But we have the best evidence, that the great body of the Jewish nation, as far back as history extends, have neither believed in the Trinity, nor in the Deity of the Messiah. The universal opinion among them in modern times is, we presume, well known and acknowledged. "A great and well known difficulty in the conversion of the Jews," says Dr. Jortin, "is the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which they have always been taught to look upon as not reconcilable with the unity of God."\* And, with respect to the Deity of the Messiah, we presume no one will dispute, that the remark of Orobio, a learned Jew, in his controversy with Limborch, expresses the sentiments of the modern Jews. "Admitting," says he, "what is impossible, that the Messiah expected by the Jews should teach the doctrine that he himself is the true God, he ought to be stoned as a false prophet."†

And history tells of no time, when these were not the general sentiments of the Jews. From what is made known of their sentiments in their intercourse with our Saviour, we know that, in general at least, they expected only a triumphant human king. And the earliest writers after the times of our Saviour, on whom much reliance can be placed, give us very explicit testimony on the subject. In his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, Justin represents Trypho as saying, "The doctrine of the incarnation is so extraordinary, that it can never be proved. That this Christ was a God, existing before the ages, is not only extraordinary but ridiculous." "To this," says Justin, "I answered, 'I know that this doctrine appears strange, especially to those of your race.'"

In another passage he says, "Jesus may still be the Christ of God, though I should not be able to prove his preëxistence, as the son of God, who made all things. For, though I should

---

\* Remarks on Eccles. Hist., Vol. III. p. 438.

† Limborch, *Amica Collatio*, p. 111.

not prove that he had preëxisted, it will be right to say, that in this respect only I have been deceived, and not to deny that he is the Christ, if he appears to be a man born of men, and to have become the Christ by election." To this Trypho replies, "They who think that Jesus was a man, and, being chosen of God, was anointed the Christ, appear to me to advance a more probable opinion than yours. For *all of us* expect, that the Christ will be born a man from man (*ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἀνθρώπου*), and that Elias will come to anoint him. If he therefore be the Christ, he must by all means be a man born of man." \*

Origen testifies, that "the Jews were not acquainted with the incarnation of the only-begotten son of God." In another place he reproaches Celsus for his ignorance in not knowing, "that the Jews never believed that the Messiah would be God, or the son of God."

Such was the belief in regard to the Messiah in the great body of the Jewish nation. And nearly as much as this is admitted by those, who contend that some relics of the Trinity and of the belief in the Deity of the Messiah are yet to be found in some of the Jewish writers. No one has been more famous in that department than Dr. Allix, in a work abounding in incorrect statements and still more in inconclusive reasonings, published in 1699 under the title of "The Judgment of the Jewish Church against the Unitarians." After adducing some of the notions of the Cabalists, which seem to him to look like the Trinity, he says, "All this is still the more remarkable, 1. Because the common Jews have well nigh quite lost the notion of the Messiah being God, and they generally expect no other than a mere common man for their Redeemer. 2. Because the main body of the Jews are such zealous asserters of the unity of God, that they repeat every day the words of Deut. vi. 4. 'The Lord our God is one Lord.' It is a practice, which though now they have turned against the Christians, yet doubtless was taken up first in opposition to the Gentiles, whose polytheism was renounced in this short confession of the Jewish faith. And hence it is that they do so much celebrate R. Akiba's faith, who died in torments, with the last syllable of the word *Echad* in his mouth, which signifies the unity of God. 3. Because the Jews at the same time dispute against the Christians' doctrine of the

---

\* Justin. Dial. Opp. p. 233 — 235. Edit. Thirlby.

Trinity ; as doth *R. Saadia*, for instance, in his book entitled *Sepher Emunah*, chap. 2. 4. Because from the beginning of Christianity some Rabbins have applied themselves to find out other senses of those passages, which the Christians urge against them. This we see in *Gem. of Sanhedr.* ch. 4, sect. 2." (Allix, p. 176.)

And what is more remarkable still, Allix himself admits, that these writings, which he supposes to teach the Trinity and the Deity of the Messiah, are still popular\* amongst the very Jews who reject these opinions. They find nothing in them inconsistent with their present sentiments. None can be found among the Jews, who extract such opinions from these writings, as Dr. Allix, and a few theorists, who tread in his steps.

The opinions of the great body of the Jews being as we have proved them to be by good testimony, and as they are shown to be in all their writings, and as they are admitted to be by Trinitarians, it is of very little consequence what notions may have been entertained by a few mystical Jewish writers. Their opinions can no more help us in the inquiry what are the doctrines of the Old Testament, than some of the most fanciful and mystical writers of the present day will help those, who come a thousand years after us, in regard to the meaning of the New.

These remarks in regard to the Jewish writers are made, not because we believe they are correctly interpreted by those, who appeal to them. We have read the work of Dr. Allix, that of Schoettgen, and what Hengstenberg has written, and we cannot see any shadow of evidence of the belief of a trinity of persons in God, or of the Deity of the Messiah in any of the quotations, which they have adduced. We believe that the quotations in Allix, Schoettgen, and Hengstenberg, weighed and compared, prove the very reverse of what they are brought to prove.

Hengstenberg endeavours to maintain the identity of the angel with the Messiah by only two passages. I. The Sept. version of Isaiah ix. 5. II. One passage from the book *Sohar*.

In Isaiah ix. 5, it is said of the Messiah, "His name shall be called angel of great counsel, for I will bring peace to the princes, and health or prosperity to him ;" καὶ καλεῖται τὸ

---

\* "The Cabalists have passed and do still pass for divines among the Jews, and the Targumists for inspired men." — Allix, p. 177.

ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος· ἄξω γὰρ εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, καὶ ὑγίειαν αὐτῷ. That the Alexandrine translator did not understand the Messiah to be called by the name of the Supreme Being is evident from his rendering ἄξω by ἄγγελος instead of θεός. We cannot believe, moreover, that he meant that the child, that was to be born as the Messiah, was to be a preëxistent angel in human form, much less that he was to be any particular, preëminent angel. 1. It is not said, that his name should be called *the* angel, ὁ ἄγγελος, but angel, ἄγγελος. 2. The last clause of the verse seems to indicate the reason for which the translator supposed the name to be given. "For I will bring peace to the princes, and prosperity to him." I suppose the opinion of this translator to have been, that the child that was born would be wonderful in counsel, that is, in wisdom and foresight, exercised for the happiness of his people, so that he would be worthy of the name of angel of great counsel, that is, wisdom.\*

One more passage only is adduced by Hengstenberg to show the tradition of the Jews, that the Messiah was identical with the angel, who appeared to the Patriarchs. He passes from the Septuagint Version to the book Sohar, a book written nobody knows when, by nobody knows whom, but certainly later than the Chaldee paraphrasts, or the Talmud, or any of the sources of the ancient Jewish opinions upon which any reliance is placed.† And perhaps nothing could show the weakness of his position in a stronger light, than that, finding nothing to his purpose in the Chaldee paraphrasts, nothing in the Apocrypha, nothing even in the Talmud, he should be able to produce only a single quotation from the Cabalistic book Sohar, which had the appearance of supporting his opinion. On the other hand, we might show, that all the

\* So in 1 Mac. ii. 65, "I know that Simeon your brother is ἀνὴρ βουλῆς."

† "What of an historical nature," says Eichhorn, "can one learn from that modern spurious book Sohar?" (*Einleitung*, Vol. II. p. 41.) "It is manifestly a forged work," says Dr. Mangey, a Trinitarian, (in his Preface to the Works of Philo, p. xv.,) "manufactured in the seventh century, or perhaps later. It is not the production of Rabbi Simeon, but the forgery of a later Rabbin, greedy of gain. By this and some other Cabalistic books, some have been led to assert, that the doctrine of the Trinity was held by the Jews before Christ. But it is most certain, that they did not hold, nor could they have held, either the thing or the name."

Jewish writers have supported the testimony, which we have adduced, respecting their expectation of a human Messiah. This will not be denied. It is expressly admitted.

The solitary passage brought forward by Hengstenberg to prove that the Messiah was regarded by the ancient Jews as identical with the angel which appeared to the patriarchs, is the following. It is a remark in the book *Sohar* upon Gen. xxiv. 2, to be found in Schoettgen, Vol. II., page 427, quoted as follows. "*Sohar Genes. fol. 77, col. 303, ex versione Sommeri, p. 35. 'Cum dicitur servus ejus, intelligitur (secundum interpretationem mysticam,) servus Jehovah, senior domus ejus, paratus ad ministerium ejus. Quis vero ille est? Resp. Metatron hic est, sicuti diximus, futurus ut conjungatur corpori, (i. e. corpus humanum assumat) in utero materno.'*" This passage, as it stands here, seems to speak of an incarnation of the angel Metatron, *the servant* of Jehovah. There is nothing, however, in the passage to show that it has any reference to the Messiah, nor how the notion is derived from Gen. xxiv. 2. At any rate, without farther support, it cannot be regarded as an ancient Jewish tradition, but only a notion of the modern Cabalistic book *Sohar*, which has not been adopted by the Jews, and which possibly they may not find in the passage. How far such a passage contributes to show what was the doctrine of the Old Testament respecting the Deity of the Messiah, let the reader judge.\*

---

\* After writing the above remarks, we were lucky enough to find the passage repeated in Schoettgen, II. p. 367, with his remarks upon it. He says that the translation of Sommer is inconsistent with the language itself and with the connexion. The words are as follows, "עתיד ליפות לנופ בבתי קברי," which, Schoettgen says, should be rendered "exornaturus sit (futurus ut exornet, a rad. יפר) corpora in sepulcris." In this rendering, so far as the meaning of the words is concerned, he is supported by Buxtorf. Schoettgen also produces the passage, to which "sicuti diximus" refers in the extract from *Sohar*. *Sohar Genes. fol. 77. col. 303.* "Traditio est, R. Jochanan dixisse: Metatron, princeps facierum," (that is, prince of the angels, who are called *faces* of God) "qui est puer, servus domini sui, dominantis ipsi, præfectus animæ omni tempore, ut liberet illam ab igne illo constituto. Et ille rationem sumpturus est in sepulcris a Dumah Angelo mortuis præfecto, illumque Domino suo oblaturus est. Idem ille fermentationem ossium intra terram jacentium suscipiet, ut corpora restituat, eaque in integritate suâ, sed sine animâ, constituat. Deus vero S. B. illam in locum suum collocabit." — Schoett. II., p. 366.

Thus it appears, that the passage has no intimation of the incarnation of the Metatron, but only that, as the angel of life, the opponent of Sammael, he should be concerned in the resurrection of the dead.

As we have mentioned, Hengstenberg has abandoned the position of the identity of the Messiah with the Chaldee word of *Jehovah*. But, as some late writers have defended this opinion, especially Kuinoel, who has manifested great ignorance of the subject in his Introduction to John's Gospel, we will add a few words upon it. That the word of *Jehovah* does not denote a person distinct from Jehovah, we have already shown. That this "word," in whatever sense it was used, was not regarded as identical with the Messiah, is manifest from the following passages from the Targum of Jonathan. "The Messiah and Moses will appear at the end of the age, the one in the desert and the other at Rome, and the word of Jehovah will march between them." "If you shall be dispersed to the end of heaven, the word of Jehovah shall bring you back by the hand of Elias, the high priest, and by the hand of the king Messiah." \*

Kuinoel also infers, that some of the Jews expected a superhuman personage as the Messiah, from such passages as the following. Jalcut Simeoni, p. 2, fol. 53, 3, from the book Tanchuma upon Isaiah lii. 3. "The king Messiah is intended. He shall be exalted above Abraham, and lifted up above Moses, and be higher than the ministering angels." But that such passages are wholly inconclusive appears from this, that the same things are said of righteous Jews. Thus Schoettgen remarks, in his note upon Matt. xxii. 30: "The Jews attribute greater glory to men than to angels, not only in this but in the future life." "The Jews ascribe greater excellence to men than to angels, because men, although frail, have overcome evil desires." He supports his remarks by quotations from the same book Tanchuma, in Jalcut Simeoni, fol. 278, 1. "Observe that God loves the Israelites more than the ministering angels. How so? *Ans.* The latter are called מלאכים, (messengers or angels,) and the Israelites are so called, in Psalm ciii. 20. The angels are called holy; so are the Israelites in Levit. xix. 2. Who then is most loved? *Ans.* He whom God honors with his presence, according to Psalm lxxxii. 1."

So in another passage. "The wisdom of the just, in the times of the Messiah, shall be greater than that of the minis-

---

\* We regret that we cannot now refer to the place where these two quotations are to be found, they having been made some years ago.

tering angels."\* Kuinoel also adduces the Targum of Jonathan upon Isaiah xvi. 1, which he renders thus: "Asportent dona Messiae Israelitarum, qui robustus erit, propterea quod iste in deserto fuit rupes ecclesiae Sionis." Walton in his Polyglott gives a very different sense to the passage, thus: "Deferent tributa Christo Israel, qui fortis est super eos, qui erant in deserto, ad montem coetûs Sion." The word *רִבּוּי* is certainly plural, and, if *עַל רִבּוּי* must have the construction which Kuinoel gives it, it must be rendered, "because *they* were in the desert." And, supposing that Christ was called the rock in the desert, the meaning might be, that the Messiah would be strong, because he was *prefigured* by the rock in the desert.

Thus we have found no support in the Old Testament for either of the two propositions, which Hengstenberg undertakes to prove, that "the angel of Jehovah, who appeared to the Patriarchs, was a person distinct from Jehovah and yet Jehovah himself," or "that the Messiah was identical with the angel." We have shown that the passages from the New Testament, which he forces into the service of proving what was revealed in the Old, afford him no aid. And we have shown, that Jewish tradition, instead of supporting, is altogether inconsistent with, the supposition, that a duality of persons in God, and that the Deity of the Messiah, are doctrines of the Old Testament.

G. R. N.

---

ART. V.—1. *The Primitive Creed, Examined and Explained; in Two Parts. The First Part containing Sixteen Discourses on the Apostles' Creed. Designed for Popular Use. The Second Part containing a Dissertation on the Testimony of the early Councils and the Fathers, from the Apostolic Age to the end of the fourth Century, with Observations on certain Theological Errors of the Present Day.* By JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D., Bishop of the

---

\* See Schoettgen, II., 163. So Pirke R. Eliezer, in Jalcut Rubeni, fol. 107, 2, in Schoett. I. 514. "Before the Israelites had made the golden calf, they were more beautiful in the sight of God than the ministering angels."

Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Vermont. Burlington. 1834. 12mo. pp. 415.

2. *Christianity Vindicated, in Seven Discourses on the External Evidences of the New Testament, with a Concluding Dissertation.* By JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Vermont. Burlington. 1833. 12mo. pp. 174.
3. *The Primitive Church, compared with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Present Day; being an Examination of the Ordinary Objections against the Church, in Doctrine, Worship, and Government. Designed for Popular Use. With a Dissertation on Sundry Points of Theology and Practice, connected with the Subject of Episcopacy.* By JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Vermont. Burlington. 1835. 12mo. pp. 380.

By the Primitive Creed, Bishop Hopkins does not mean the creed of Peter, the oldest Christian creed of which we have any account; "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."\* This was the only article of faith originally deemed necessary to constitute a person externally a Christian. It presupposed, of course, a belief in one God, the Father. But the Jews had already been initiated into this belief. "Ye believe in God," said Jesus; he adds, "believe also in me,"† as the "Christ," the "anointed," the commissioned of him; the only additional truth the belief of which he required as distinctive of the Christian profession. We find the two articles again conjoined in his last solemn prayer; "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent," that is, Jesus Christ as sent of thee.‡ And thus we find, that Jews and others already acknowledging the existence of the only true God, were, by the Apostles, admitted to baptism, upon simply professing, in addition, their belief of the latter article.

We here see the origin of creeds. They were baptismal confessions, baptism being regarded as an initiatory rite by which a person was introduced into the community of believ-

---

\* Matt. xvi. 16. John vi. 69.

† John xiv. 1.

‡ John xvii. 3. St. Paul's creed corresponded. "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5.

ers, numbered among Christians. These confessions were the *symbol*,\* sign, token, or mark of Christian faith, as the ceremony of baptism was of Christian consecration. They embraced originally as we have said, in addition to the belief in the existence of one God over all, the Father, always tacitly implied, if not expressed, one simple truth, that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, which was the *primitive* Christian creed, as a belief in the one only true God constituted the primitive Jewish creed. Other articles were added from time to time, according to the discretion of individuals, or communities of believers.

The most fruitful source of additions was the numerous heresies which, in process of time, sprang up in the church, in opposition to which new clauses were successively introduced into the creeds, or symbols. They were thus perpetually growing in bulk, and, in the same proportion, becoming more dark and metaphysical, abounding more and more in absurd or unintelligible distinctions and refinements, till every feature of their original simplicity was obliterated.

By the "primitive creed," Bishop Hopkins means that usually termed the "Apostles' Creed," and he more than insinuates that it really had an apostolic origin. Such is the impression he evidently means to leave on the minds of his readers. "Many," says he, "believe, not without reason, that this is the precise form or summary of the faith which was left to the church of Rome, by the Apostles Peter and Paul." † Again; "What consideration can endear this venerable relic of early faith, more than the fact, that the disciples of the blessed Apostles, the holy martyrs and confessors, the workers of miracles, and the eminent saints, who adorned the first ages of Christianity, made it a part of their solemn worship to *recite these very words*." ‡

---

\* "Perhaps," says Neander, "this word at first denoted only the 'formula' of baptism, and was afterwards transferred to the confession of faith." — *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Vol. I. p. 352, note. Ed. Lond. 1831.

† Page 1.

‡ Page 2. The Bishop is mistaken as to the use made of creeds by Christians of the early ages. The recital of them did not form "part of their solemn worship," strictly speaking; they were not introduced, in fact, into the ordinary services of public worship; they were used only at baptism. The person to be baptized was examined as to his belief of certain Scriptural truths, or summaries of truth, to each article of which

We have read these and similar statements with unfeigned astonishment. We would willingly impute them to inattention or ignorance, or to the author's loose way of thinking and writing, which seems to be habitual with him. But we fear that we must ascribe them to a less creditable origin. We must confess they have too much the appearance of design; and, as we are constrained to admit that the Bishop in other parts of the volumes before us, is not above resorting to artifice and trick, for the sake of impression, we can the more readily believe that he has, in the present case, allowed himself to speak rather for effect on ignorant minds, than with a scrupulous regard to exactness. We do not, it is true, rate his learning very high. Whoever looks into his publications with the expectation of finding in them evidence of ripe scholarship, nice critical acumen, theological research, or even a tolerable acquaintance with Christian antiquity, and the literary history and value of the several writings attributed to it, will find himself grievously disappointed. But, scanty as are his stores of antiquarian and critical learning, he must certainly know better than to set down the Apostles as the real authors of the creed which passes under their name. It is rather too late in the day to attempt to revive the credit of this stale fiction.

That the creed in question was not the production of the Apostles, is a point which has been long universally conceded by the learned, both Protestant and Catholic, and to go into a discussion of it would be a mere waste of time and labor. For the benefit of Bishop Hopkins, however, we will give two or three quotations and references, after which we will state a few facts relating to the history of the document.

The Bishop says that the creed is "*not without reason*" believed to be the "*precise form or summary*" left by the Apostles Peter and Paul; that "*these very words*" were recited, as "*part of their solemn worship,*" by the immediate disciples of the Apostles, the "*workers of miracles, and the eminent saints*" of primitive days. But hear what Mosheim, an author whose statements are entitled to some little respect, says in reference to the opinion which assigns the composition of it to the Apostles. "*All who have any knowledge of anti-*

---

he was required separately to give his assent, these summaries, for some centuries, varying according to the judgment and will of those who administered the rite.

quity, confess unanimously, that this opinion is a mistake, and has no foundation."\* Dr. Isaac Barrow, an old English divine of some eminence, of whom Bishop Hopkins may possibly have heard, speaks of the "original composition and use" of the creed as "not known," and argues that "in ancient times there was no one form generally fixed and agreed upon," that the "most ancient and learned" of the Fathers, were either "wholly ignorant that such a form, pretending the Apostles for its authors, was extant, or did not accord to its pretence, or did not at all rely on the authenticalness thereof."† Dr. Barrow wrote more than a century and a half ago. The well-known Du Pin, too, a little later, resolutely combated the notion that the creed was written by the Apostles; pronounces it "very improbable"; says that it is evident that the Apostles "did not draw up any one form of faith comprehended in a set number of words;" that there is "no rashness here in departing from the vulgar opinion;" that the advocates for its Apostolic origin, are obliged to yield, when urged, and acknowledge that "our creed is not the Apostles' as to the words."‡ "That it is rash to attribute it to the Apostles," says Buddeus, "is not only proved by the clearest reasons, but the more prudent and candid among the Romanists themselves confess it."§ "All learned persons," says Sir Peter King, "are now agreed, that it never was composed by the Apostles."|| "It is not known by whom, or at what precise time," observes Bishop Tomline, "this creed was written." "The Apostles did not prescribe any creed."¶ "No one," says Neander, "imagined that the Apostles had composed this confession in so many words." It was supposed to contain the doctrine which had "descended from the tradition of the Apostles," which "they preached both *vivâ voce* and by their writings," hence called the "Apostolic preaching," or "Apostolic tradition;" and "the misunderstanding of this name afterwards produced the fiction, that the Apostles themselves had literally composed this confession."\*\*

---

\* Institutes of Eccles. Hist., Vol. I. p. 96, Murdock's Translation.

† Exposition of the Creed. Works, Vol. I. p. 357. fol. Lond. 1716.

‡ New Hist. Eccles. Writers, Vol. I. p. 9. Lond. 1693.

§ Ecclesia Apostolica, p. 191. Jen. 1729.

|| Primitive Church. Part II. p. 57. Lond. 1719.

¶ Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles. Art. VIII. See Elements of Christian Theology, Vol. II. pp. 224—226. Ed. Lond. 1804.

\*\* Neander, History of the Christian Religion and Church, Vol. I. p. 351.

We might adduce numerous other testimonies, but the above are sufficient and more than sufficient to show what all the world, with the exception of the Bishop of Vermont, knew before, that the question of the Apostolic origin of the creed has been long satisfactorily settled. The tradition which ascribes to it such an origin cannot be traced in any writings now extant, or of which we have any account, of a date earlier than the end of the fourth century. We first meet with it in Rufinus, bishop of Aquileia, who wrote late in the fourth and early in the fifth century.\* The Apostles, says he, according to the tradition of the Fathers, being about to disperse to carry the Gospel into different parts, assembled to determine the rule of their future preaching, and being full of the Holy Spirit, each one of them contributed what was agreeable to his own views, thus forming a creed, which was to guide them in their teachings, and to be delivered as a rule to believers.† The writer of a piece falsely attributed to Augustine, proceeds so far as to point out the particular article contributed by each Apostle.

Had this tradition been founded in truth, it is difficult to account for the fact that the creed was not, like the other known productions of the Apostles, admitted into the number of canonical writings; that Luke, in relating the acts of the Apostles, has observed a total silence on the subject; and, still further, that no allusion to any such document, as a production of the Apostles, occurs in any of the learned Fathers of greater antiquity than Rufinus, as Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Minutius Felix, Origen, Cyprian, Lactantius, the historian Eusebius, Athanasius, and many others, though in their disputes with heretics, occasions innumerable occurred, on which they could have alleged nothing more appropriate and decisive than several clauses of the creed, had it existed as a known or reputed relic of the Apostles. During the same period, numerous councils were assembled, some of which formed creeds, which were regarded as authoritative, and were used in the rite of baptism, an act then deemed of the greatest

---

\* We make no account of a piece attributed to Ambrose of Milan, containing an allusion to the tradition, since the document is admitted by universal consent to be spurious. Were it genuine, its testimony would add little weight to the tradition, being cotemporary, or nearly so, with that of Rufinus. Ambrose died A. D. 398; Rufinus survived him but twelve years.

† *Expositio Symboli.*

solemnity ; yet in none of the canons of those councils, and in none of their creeds, is there the slightest allusion to any existing creed claiming an Apostolic sanction. It is farther observable, that whenever the Ante-Nicene Fathers attempt, as they frequently do, to give a sort of abstract of Christian doctrine, they allow themselves no small latitude both of sentiment and expression, always differing from each other, and from themselves at different times ; a circumstance which can be explained only on the supposition, that there was no authoritative symbol to which they could appeal, but that each individual or body and division of believers were left to express their own views of Christian truth in their own way. The Roman creed, in the form in which we first meet with it, differed from the old Oriental, in existence, it would seem, before the Nicene or Constantinopolitan, and both, as we shall presently see, from that of Aquileia. It differed, too, from the Jerusalem creed, expounded by Cyril about A. D. 340 ; and yet, had the Apostles, before their separation, as the tradition given by Rufinus states, composed a creed to be the rule of their future preaching, and a standard of faith to all believers, the fact must have been known to the Christians of Jerusalem, and we can hardly suppose that the Church in that place, the mother of all the rest, would have suffered so valuable a legacy to be lost, and the very memory of it to have perished.

Rufinus, in his account of the origin of the creed, was followed by Jerome and the Latin Fathers generally, and the tradition was currently believed till the time of the Reformation. Erasmus was one of the first in modern times to call it in question, and subsequent inquiries, as we have said, have led to its utter rejection, except by the "Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Vermont."

Even he, notwithstanding his confident assertions, seems at times to have had some misgivings ; for in a Dissertation, as he strangely enough terms it, annexed to his Discourses on the Creed, after observing that he does "not intend to discuss the question whether the particular form of words, known throughout so many centuries as the Apostles' Creed, was delivered in its present shape by the Apostles themselves," which, in the Discourses, he affirms there was "good reason" for believing, he proceeds to say, "Such *was* undoubtedly the

prevailing opinion of the Christian church in all ages." \* But even this assertion is a great deal broader than facts warrant. It *was* the prevailing opinion from the beginning of the fifth century, not before, till the time of the Reformation, or a little later. From the moment the human mind awoke from the slumber of the dark ages, it began to lose ground, and, like a multitude of other absurdities, which had before obtained currency, was at length exploded.

It is more difficult to trace the origin and gradual completion of the Apostles' Creed than to refute the hypothesis which ascribes it to an act of the Apostles. In its primitive and simpler form, it may probably have been the baptismal creed of the Roman Christians. As the Roman Church rose to celebrity, its creed, of course, would grow in dignity and importance along with it; and when finally it came to be denominated, by way of eminence, the "Apostolical" church, founded, according to tradition, by the very chief of the Apostles, and by Paul, it is not surprising that its symbol also should have claimed for itself the distinction of an Apostolic origin.

There are several other creeds, or summaries of faith, however, of which an earlier record remains than of this. The first which occurs is that of Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul, who flourished near the end of the second century. "The Church," he says, "dispersed throughout the whole world, to the remotest confines of the earth, holds the faith which it received from the Apostles and their disciples, which is in one God, the Father, Almighty, who made heaven, and earth, and the sea and all that is therein; and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit which, by the prophets, preached the economy, and the advent, and birth from the virgin, and passion, and resurrection from the dead, and assumption, in the flesh, into heaven, of our beloved Lord Jesus Christ, and his coming from heaven, in the glory of the Father, to consummate all things, and to raise up all flesh of the whole human race, that to Christ Jesus, our Lord and God, and Saviour and King, according to the good pleasure of the invisible Father, every knee may bow of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue may confess to him, and that he may execute just judgment on all, casting

into eternal fire spiritual wickedness, and angels that are transgressors, being apostate, and impious men and unjust, and flagitious and blasphemous, but to the just and holy who have observed his precepts, and persevered in his love from the first, or after repentance, granting eternal life, and conferring on them incorruption and eternal glory." \*

Another shorter summary occurs in the same author, of a character similar to the preceding.†

Tertullian, bishop of Carthage, who flourished about the year 200, a little after the time of Irenæus, gives us three creeds, or abstracts of Christian doctrine, the shortest of which is as follows. "There is only one rule of faith, which is not to be changed nor reformed; to believe in one God, Almighty, maker of the world, and his Son, Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, the third day raised from the dead, received into heaven, now sitting at the right hand of the Father, and who shall come to judge the quick and dead, through the resurrection of the flesh."‡ This presents a very near resemblance in language to parts of the Apostles' Creed, but wants, as will be readily perceived, several articles found in the latter, and, what is remarkable, it contains no reference whatever to the Holy Spirit. In the other two, which are much longer, the similarity is far less striking, and they are somewhat tinctured with the subtilties of the Alexandrian Platonists, which pervaded all the theological writings of the age.

---

\* Adv. Hær. L. I. c. 10. Bishop Hopkins (p. 258) professes to give a translation of this creed, and places the Greek at the foot of the page. In his version, for "Apostles and *their* disciples," as in the original, he gives "Apostles and *other* disciples." This may be an inadvertency. Another, and more important variation from the original we observe, whether caused by accident or design we are unable to say. The clause translated literally is as follows: "and in the Holy Spirit, which by the prophets preached the economy and the advent, and birth from the virgin, and passion, and resurrection from the dead, and assumption in the flesh into heaven, of our beloved Lord Jesus Christ." After the word *advent*, the Bishop, without any authority whatever from the original, has thrust in "of God"! We can conceive of no adequate motive for this. The sentence does not require the addition to render the sense complete. The meaning is clear without it, and is only embarrassed by the interpolation.

† L. III. c. 4.

‡ De Velandis Virginibus, c. 1. The other two are found, Adv. Prax. c. 2, and De Præscript. Hæreticorum, c. 13. Ed. Par. 1646.

Two passages occur in the writings of Origen containing a creed or general summary of Christian truth, as he understood it, and as it was to be gathered, as he says, from the Scriptures; one very brief,\* and the other longer, and embracing nearly the same topics introduced into that of Irenæus given above, but treated in a more diffuse way, and presenting a broader line of distinction between the Father and the Son.†

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, about the middle of the third century, comes next, who tells us that persons, on being baptized, were required to express their belief "in God, the Father, his Son, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the remission of sins, and eternal life through the holy church."‡

We have another by Gregory Thaumaturgus, of Neocæsarea, a disciple of Origen, somewhat longer, and more dark and metaphysical, and as unlike as possible to the Apostles' Creed.

Nothing else in the shape of a creed occurs, in any genuine writing of the first three centuries.§ The Nicene soon followed, which was somewhat augmented by the council of Constantinople, A. D. 381; and the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, the former A. D. 431, and the latter A. D. 451, forbade the making, or the use of any other, taking no notice of the Apostles' Creed, and thus virtually excluding it.|| It was not customary to recite the creed at every administration of divine service, in the Eastern church, before the beginning of the sixth century, and in the Western till near the end of the same; and the creed thus recited was the Nicene or Constantinopolitan just referred to, and not the Apostles'.

Rufinus, to whom, as we have said, we are indebted for the tradition of the Apostolic origin of the creed, has preserved a copy of it, as it existed in his time, the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, under three different forms as used in different churches; or rather he has given us three

\* Comment. in Johan., T. 32.

† Proem to Book of Principles.

‡ Epist. 76.

§ Bishop Hopkins quotes from a confession of faith contained in a Letter ascribed to the first council of Antioch, and addressed to Paul of Samosata, apparently without being aware that the document is spurious.

|| The fact is adverted to by Charles Butler, in the following words: "When the council of Ephesus, and afterwards the council of Chalcedon, proscribed all creeds except the Nicene, neither of them excepted the symbol of the Apostles from the general proscription." — *Historical and Literary Account of Confessions.*

creeds, the Roman, the Oriental, and that of Aquileia. That the Roman, in its more brief form, existed before his time, is not to be doubted, for its simplicity bears decided marks of antiquity ; but of its history previous to this period nothing certain is known. Sir Peter King, in his excellent work,\* has attempted to analyze it, and distinguish the articles of which it was originally composed from the clauses afterwards introduced in opposition to the several heresies which successively sprang up in the church ; but, from the paucity of facts history has preserved, he is often compelled to resort to arguments which are purely conjectural.

It appears from Rufinus, that the first article of the Roman creed, as it stood in his time, and of that of Aquileia, wanted the clause "maker of heaven and earth" ; and that the Oriental creed had, instead of it, "invisible and impassible," added, according to Rufinus, in opposition to the Sabellian heresy. The Roman, too, omitted the epithet *one* before "God," and stood simply "I believe in God, the Father Almighty." The second article differs little, in the three creeds, except in the collocation of the words, which varies considerably, and, instead of "Jesus Christ," the Oriental creed reads *one* Jesus Christ, in common with the Nicene and the older Greek creeds generally. The present creed retains the article, as it stood in the Roman. The third article is the same in the three, the present creed differing verbally from all. In the fourth article, the words "suffered" and "dead," found in the present creed, are wanting in the three ancient, and the phrase "descended into hell," is found only in that of Aquileia, being wanting in both the Roman and Oriental. The fifth is the same in all four, as also the sixth, excepting that the epithet "Almighty" is wanting in that of Aquileia and the Roman. The seventh is the same precisely in all. In the eighth, the present creed repeats "I believe," which is not found in this place in either of the three mentioned by Rufinus. In the ninth article, the present creed differs in three particulars from that of Aquileia, the Roman, and Oriental. In the three latter, the word "*Catholic*" is wanting, as also the phrase "communion of saints," at the end ; and the words "I believe," which are wanting in the preceding article, are inserted at the commencement of this.

---

\* History of the Apostles' Creed, with Critical Observations on its several Articles.

In the three old creeds, the article was simply, "I believe the holy church." The tenth article is the same in all; the eleventh also, with a single exception, that of Aquileia having "*this* body," instead of "*the* body," as in the rest. With this clause the three old creeds end, the twelfth article, or "And the life everlasting," found in the present creed, being wanting in all. \*

Some of these variations are in themselves unimportant. It will be perceived, however, from our comparison, that since the end of the fourth century, the Roman, or Apostles' creed, has received four considerable additions; the clause "descended into hell," in the fourth article, the epithet "Catholic" and the clause "communion of saints," in the ninth, and the whole of the last.

The clause "descended into hell" first appears, it would seem, in the Arian creed of Ariminum, A. D. 359. It is also found in a creed recorded by Epiphanius, who flourished in the latter part of the fourth century, and also in that of Cyril of Jerusalem. At what time it was admitted into the Roman and Oriental creeds, we have no means of ascertaining. It was adopted, as Sir Peter King thinks, as an antidote to the heresy of Apollinarius, who denied the reality of Christ's human soul.

The term "catholic" first appears in the creed of Alexander of Alexandria, about the period of the rise of the Arian controversy. It is found also in Epiphanius, from whom it passed to the Latins. At what time it found its way into the Roman creed is uncertain. The clause "communion of saints" was added, as is supposed, in reference to the schism of the Donatists, probably during the fifth century. It is not known on what occasion, or when, the last clause, relating to the "life everlasting," was added. The creed first appears in its present form in the time of Gregory the Great, who died A. D. 604.

With the history of the document we have now done. We leave the Bishop to explain the facts we have stated, consistently with his cherished persuasion, that the creed he reads from the Prayer Book contains the "precise form" left by the Apostles, and recited by their disciples, the "holy martyrs,"

---

\* Rufin. *Expositio Symboli*. See also, Du Pin, T. I. p. 12, and G. J. Vossius de *Tribus Symbolis*. Dissert. I. § 31—43.

and "workers of miracles." We proceed to give some further account of the contents of his book.

The title of the volume, is the "*Primitive Creed Examined and Explained*." Any other title would have been equally appropriate. He enters into no *examination* of the creed, either historically or critically. The first article in the table of contents to the volume is, the "*Origin of the Creed*." But he engages in no discussion in regard to its origin. He asserts, as we have said, that it is believed with reason to have been made by the Apostles, in the precise form in which we now have it, and there he leaves the matter.

The volume is divided into two parts, the first of which is composed of sixteen discourses on the creed, designed, as he says, for "popular use." But they contain no *explanation* whatever of the creed, in any correct sense of the term. If the *animus componendi*, the views of the author, be essential to a true exposition, he cannot be said even to have approached the subject. He is at no pains to ascertain how the several articles were understood by the original framers of the creed. The discourses consist of a series of doctrinal harangues, on the Trinity, and kindred topics, written not in the best possible taste, having only the semblance of argument, and setting at defiance every correct principle of biblical criticism and interpretation.

It is not our intention to follow the author through his strange medley of unsupported assertions, and futile and absurd inferences. His book is not worth a serious reply. The proofs he adduces are of the stalest kind, and all of them that are deserving of notice have been already fifty times refuted. We cannot suffer the occasion to pass, however, without furnishing our readers with a specimen of the sort of reasoning which a dignitary of the American Episcopal church can condescend to use, in support of the "trinitarian faith," the denial of which he regards as a most "perilous" thing.

In this view, the book is indeed a curiosity, a marvel. We read it with much the same sort of feeling with which we should read a set of monkish expositions of the days of Rabanus Maurus, or Remigius of Auxerre,\* with the exception only of

---

\* Two, among a host of worthless expositors, of the ninth century, who professed to derive their materials from the Fathers, and delighted in seeking far-fetched and recondite meanings. Rabanus, in particular,

our surprise on discovering, from the title-page and several modern allusions contained in the volume, that we are perusing a production not of the ninth, but of the nineteenth century.

Before we offer the specimens alluded to, however, we must take notice of an opinion the Bishop has thought fit to express in regard to the merits of the Fathers, as expositors of Scripture. We are induced to do this, in the present connexion, from the circumstance that the Bishop's own achievements in the exegetical art, furnish, in our view, no unapt commentary on the opinion, being the most precious morsel of absurdity we have met with for many a day. The opinion to which, to do him justice, he adheres throughout with consistent pertinacity, is thus expressed in his preface: "Next to the Scriptures, and as the *best school for sound scriptural interpretation*, he (the Bishop) holds the writers of the first ages in the highest esteem." \*

In reading this very extraordinary statement we were at first at a loss to determine whom the writer intended to designate as writers of the "first ages." We could not suppose that he had reference simply to the Apostolical Fathers, as they are called. For, besides that no genuine and undisputed remains of these Fathers are now extant, the writings circulated under their name, whatever evidences of piety they may afford, are not such, we should think, that even Dr. Hopkins would be fond of appealing to them as containing specimens of critical judgment or "sound scriptural interpretation." On examination, we find that by "primitive" writers, he means to designate the Fathers of the first four centuries. He expressly calls Irenæus a "primitive witness"; and at the commencement of the first chapter of his dissertation, which composes the second part of the volume, and in which he professes to adduce the "testimony" in favor of the Trinity found in the writers of the first four centuries, he calls this, "the testimony of the primitive church," which, "next to the Scriptures," he sees not "how any reflecting person can avoid holding in the highest esteem." † He speaks of the "declarations of faith which occur in the earlier writers and councils," in reference to the same period. And again, at the close of the chapter,

---

was much celebrated in his day, and his works are comprised in six folio volumes.

\* p. viii.

† p. 257.

after observing that he has "traced the trinitarian faith from the creed of Irenæus" down to the "latter part of the fourth century," he terms the evidence thus adduced that of the "primitive church." \* We should use the expression in a much more restricted sense. Of the propriety or impropriety of the more extended sense in which the Bishop employs it, however, we have no disposition to enter into controversy with him. Our only object has been to ascertain what Fathers he includes in the number of writers of the "first" or "earlier" ages, whom he pronounces the very best interpreters of the Scriptures.

We confess we were not a little surprised to hear the claim of a sound interpretation of the Scriptures thus broadly asserted, in favor of the old Fathers, from Irenæus down to John Chrysostom. For, sincerely as we venerate their piety, and the many noble traits of character they exhibited, worthy of all admiration; sensible as we are of the value of their writings as repositories of facts we could derive from no other source; and highly as we esteem their labors and sacrifices, by means of which Christianity triumphed over the polluted and debasing superstitions of Paganism, we had supposed that the time had gone by, when their expositions of Christian truth and the Christian records would be appealed to as entitled to any extraordinary respect.

Many of them were learned; but few of them knew how to apply their learning to any good purpose. With the exception of Origen and Jerome, they were not versed in the original language of the Old Testament, but relied on the faulty Version of the Seventy, to which they attributed a sort of inspiration. Of the Arabic, the Syriac, and other languages, having an affinity, greater or less, with the Hebrew, or useful in unlocking sources of information tending to throw light on Jewish records and opinions, they were ignorant. The theology of most of them exhibited a strange and unnatural union of Christian doctrines with the philosophy taught in the Platonic schools of Alexandria, the most worthless that ever disgraced the human intellect; and they were, almost without exception, addicted to the fanciful modes of interpretation, and particularly the allegorizing spirit, which characterized the same schools. There is no species of absurdity, in interpretation,

---

\* pp. 313, 314.

reasoning, faith, or opinion, of which their writings do not furnish abundant examples. But we are not about to discuss the merits of the Fathers. We consider the question touching their claims to respect, so far as the point under consideration is concerned, as already fully settled in the several learned treatises which have at different times appeared on the subject, by which, however, the Bishop, if he has condescended to read them, gives evidence of having profited little. We will give a few specimens of their exegetical and doctrinal skill and accuracy, and then proceed to show, by some examples, with what fidelity he has trodden in their steps.

Justin, the earliest of them, found a hidden meaning in almost every sentence and word of the Old Testament, and could prove any doctrine from any passage. He was a believer in the Jewish dream of the millennium, or fleshly reign of Christ and his saints for a thousand years on earth, which he thought had the support of Scripture, and in proof of which he appealed to the text; "The day of the Lord is a thousand years," and again, "As the days of a tree shall be the days of my people"!

Irenæus and others detected the Trinity, such as it was in their day, in texts which, to ordinary mortals, would seem as applicable to any thing else as to that. The just named Father found an illustration and confirmation of it in the two spies who came to Rahab.\* The two, the good Father, either from lapse of memory, or because it better suited his purpose, changes into three, and he proceeds gravely to remark, that "Rahab, the harlot, received the three spies, who came to explore the land, and hid them with her, namely, the Father, and the Son, with the Holy Spirit."† This same Rahab makes a conspicuous figure in the theology and commentaries of the Fathers. Several of them, as Ambrose, Augustine, and others, make her a type of the Gentile church, and the scarlet cord by which the spies were let down through the window by the wall, was emblematic of the blood of Christ, by which we obtain salvation.

Jesse, sending David to seek his brethren,‡ according to Augustine, is a type of God, the Father, who sent his Son, of whom it is written, "I will declare thy name to my *brethren*." By the three measures of parched corn, which it seems he

\* Josh. ii.

† L. IV. C. 20. Ed. Par. 1710.

‡ 1 Sam. xvii.

took with him, the shrewd Father observes, is to be understood the Trinity!

They found the Trinity, too, in the act of Elijah, stretching himself three times on the dead child; and again in the text, "A threefold cord is not quickly broken." "Trinitas non rumpitur." They allegorized the story of David and Bathsheba. David, it was said, represented Christ, — Bathsheba, the church, his spouse, — and Uriah, the Devil! They found types of Christ, or of his cross, everywhere; in Judah, "washing his garments in wine;" in David, slaying the lion and the bear, Christ doing the same when he descended into *hades* to rescue imprisoned spirits; in Balaam's ass,\* though according to Origen the latter represented the church, which formerly bore evil powers, but now Christ. The tree of life in Paradise, prefigured the cross; and so did Moses' rod, Jacob's staff, and the oak of Mamre, and the "seventy willows" found by the Israelites after crossing the Jordan; all either typified the cross, or had some other symbolic property equally precious. In fact there is too much ground for the sarcastic remark once made, that there is scarcely a piece of wood or dry stick mentioned in the Old Testament, which has not, by the fertile imagination of one or another of these Fathers, been raised to the dignity of prefiguring the cross.†

---

\* Irenæus.

† If, in speaking of the Fathers as the best interpreters of Scripture, the Bishop refers not to their expositions of its language, strictly so called, but to their teachings as furnishing a sort of guide to its interpretation, from the presumption that those, who lived near the times of the Saviour and the Apostles, would be more likely than others, of a remote age, to retain the construction originally put on their words, as of this construction there would be a sort of current tradition, the case is not much altered. The language of the Saviour, we know, was in many respects entirely misapprehended by the early Christians, and their successors for several ages. Of this we have evidence in the construction which was put on his discourse relating to the destruction of Jerusalem, from which the first disciples derived the impression, that the world was speedily to be dissolved, and Christ visibly to descend to judgment. Time soon corrected or modified this error. Still, among the Fathers of the first four centuries, there was a very prevalent expectation, founded partly on some expressions used by Paul, and partly on Jewish tradition, that the millennial reign of Christ, the end of the world, the day of final judgment and renovation of all things, was near. The misapprehensions of the early Christians on these and other points we might mention, show that their conceptions of the purport of our

Many of Bishop Hopkins's arguments for the Trinity strongly remind us of those of the Fathers above referred to. They are worth just about as much ; and his ingenuity in extracting types and resemblances, entitles him, we think, to rank among the worthy pupils of Justin Martyr or Origen. Thus he makes the sacrifice of Isaac the type of our Saviour's resurrection. The whole transaction, he tells us, was "typical and figurative, shadowing forth, by the most affecting emblem, the love of God the Father, who spared not his own Son, — the love of the Son of God, who submitted to such sufferings for our sakes, — and the resurrection of our great Redeemer from the grave, even as Isaac was raised from the pile, on which he had been bound for a burnt-offering."\* Not only was the fact of the resurrection "announced beforehand" by type, but the time of it, says the Doctor, was prefigured, by type also. This type he finds not simply in the history of Jonah. He has discovered another, with which he seems to be marvelously pleased, in the "sheaf" which, by command of Moses, the priest was required to wave before the Lord on the day after the (Jewish) Sabbath, the very day, the Bishop does not fail to observe, on which our Saviour rose. "Thus," says he, "we have another type, in which the very day of the resurrection is presignified, and the whole of which shadows forth, most interestingly, the doctrine of the text."† The ascension of Christ was typified by the high priest entering once a year into the holy of holies, — the tabernacle, according to the Bishop, representing the world, — the holy of holies, the heavens, into which the high priest alone could enter, and he but once a year, after "a solemn atonement offering." "Now all this," says the Bishop, "was typical of Christ."‡ The exaltation of Christ was prefigured by Joseph, who, after he was delivered from prison, was made a ruler by Pharaoh, "a clear representation of the exaltation of Christ, who came from prison and judgment, and the dungeon of the grave, and was raised by God, the Father, to the rule and government of the Universe."§ Of course, he finds numerous types of the atone-

---

Saviour's teachings, whencesoever derived, are entitled to very little respect.

\* p. 91.

† p. 99. The text referred to is Rom. iv. 25: "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification."

‡ p. 105.

§ p. 106, 7.

ment; the "sacrifice of Isaac by his father Abraham," the paschal lamb; — but, adds the Bishop, suddenly checking himself in the act of enumeration, "the time would fail us, if we were to notice the tenth part of those types of the death and the atonement of our blessed Sacrifice, which the Mosaic institutions contain in their ceremonial law." \*

We will now state a few of the Bishop's proofs and illustrations of the Trinity. A numerous class of these proofs he finds in the application of common titles, names, and epithets, to the Father and the Son. His argument drawn from this source goes on the principle, that, whenever the same term or expression, though used in a different sense, is applied to two individuals, those individuals must necessarily be one. This principle, thus announced in plain terms, appears so perfectly absurd, that our readers may be inclined to doubt whether any man of common understanding can possibly adopt it as the foundation of his reasonings. And yet many of the Bishop's Scriptural proofs, if carefully examined, will be found to be worth nothing, except on the assumption of the correctness of this principle.

Thus, because God is called a "Saviour" and Christ a "Saviour," he infers that "both must possess the same divine nature." But so are a multitude of others said in the Scriptures to save, or are called "saviours." Othniel and Jehoshaphat are called "Saviours." Does this prove that they possessed supreme divinity? Again, because David says, "The Lord (Jehovah) is my shepherd, I shall not want," and Isaiah, speaking of the Messiah, says, "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd," therefore Christ must be God! Again, Ezekiel calls God "the husband of the church;" and John, in allusion to Jesus, says, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom;" therefore God and Jesus are one! Again, few names or epithets are more frequently applied to God in the Old Testament, than that of "Redeemer." He "redeemed Israel" from Egyptian bondage; the "Most High God was their redeemer;" "as for our redeemer, the Lord of hosts is his name." But Christ, in the New Testament, is said to have redeemed us; we "have redemption through him," therefore, so argues the Bishop, with apparent seriousness, "Christ Jesus is the Lord of hosts." God, too, is called a "preserver," or

---

\* p. 80.

is said to "preserve"; Job says, "What shall I do unto thee, O thou Preserver of men?" "Preserve me, O God," says the Psalmist. But Christians are said to be "sanctified and preserved in Jesus Christ." "What plainer evidence can be asked," exclaims the Bishop, "to prove that in this also the Saviour is shown to be divine?"\* And he goes on to fill page after page with such stuff. But our readers will be satisfied, we think, with the above specimens, which, so far as the proof of the Trinity is concerned, are just about on a level with the "three measures of parched corn," the three spies, entertained by Rahab, or the three daughters of Job.†

The Bishop's illustrations of the Trinity, too, bear a striking analogy to several of those employed by the Fathers, but which have been generally abandoned by modern Trinitarians, as going to destroy either the trinity or the unity, and as therefore not suited to their purpose. But the Bishop is not disconcerted by trifles. One of his illustrations is intended to show that there is no contradiction in saying that three is one. "Take," says he, "the sun in the firmament, and you will find that it is three and one. There is, first, the round orb; secondly, the light; thirdly, the heat. Each one of these we call the sun. When you say, that the sun is almost 900,000 miles in diameter, you speak of the round orb; when you say, that the sun is bright, you mean the light; when you say, that the sun is warm, you mean the heat. The orb is the sun, the light is the sun, and the heat is the sun; and they all mean different things, and still there is but one sun. Here is a manifest trinity and unity even in a material substance, known and understood by all, yet it is just as open to objection as the

---

\* p. 36.

† The Bishop's scriptural argument to prove that Christ instituted two orders of the priesthood is of a similar character. Thus, Christ commissioned the twelve Apostles (Luke ix); "but," says Bishop Hopkins, "in the very next chapter we read, that 'after these things the Lord appointed seventy others also, and sent them two and two before his face, into every city and place whither he himself would come.'" The former, that is, the Twelve, according to him, were the head (under Christ, the Chief Shepherd and Bishop of souls,) of the sacred order of Bishops; the latter, that is, the Seventy, of the ordinary priests or elders! "And we see," says he, "how soon they supplied the third order, by the appointment of deacons." On so slight a foundation does he rear the magnificent fabric of Diocesan Episcopacy. — *The Primitive Church*, &c., pp. 194 — 198.

Christian doctrine, that the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; yet these are different persons, while, nevertheless, there is but one God." \*

Was there ever such egregious trifling? Here is one sun, contemplated as producing two different effects, occasioning in us the sensations of light and heat. But what is all this to the purpose? We may say, according to the old theory, that light is a part, or an emanation of the sun; or it is the effect of its presence in our system; and so of heat, it is an effect of its presence. But we do not, and cannot without absurdity, say that each of them is the sun itself, using the term constantly in the same sense. When the Bishop says, that the "round orb is the sun, the light is the sun, and the heat is the sun," yet there are "not three suns, but one sun," he must either utter nonsense, or he uses the same term in different senses in his several affirmations. Will he admit the latter supposition in regard to the proposition which the example is adduced to illustrate? When he says, "The Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, yet there are not three Gods, but one God," will he admit that the term God changes its signification in each of these allegations? If not, the illustration is nothing to his purpose. It is either not true, or not applicable except in a sense, which would annihilate the Trinity.

His two next illustrations are, if any thing, still more unfortunate. Thus he asks, "Is not every man living an example of a trinity and unity in his own person? Has he not a soul, a rational mind, and a body?"—"Each of these we call the man, and they are all different from each other, and yet there are not three men, but one man." Again, "Even in the very mind itself, according to the old system of metaphysics, we may discover another, and perhaps on some accounts, a closer illustration. There is the judgment, the memory, and the imagination, three faculties, each of which we call mind."—"Yet, although each is called mind, there are not three minds, but one mind!" †

In these illustrations, the objection before mentioned again occurs. The terms are used in different senses in different parts of the statement, and some of them in very strange senses too, and such as we venture to say were never before attributed to them. The Bishop enumerates three modes in

---

\* p. 20.

† pp. 20, 21.

which the mind acts, three states, or operations, or, if he will, three "faculties." To each of these, if his illustration has any pertinency, he must attribute all the attributes of mind. He must say of memory, for example, that it thinks, compares, combines, and of itself performs all mental acts. And so of the rest. Nor do we see why he should limit himself to a triple division, for there are several other faculties or states of mind, which are just as much entitled to be called mind, as memory, imagination, and judgment. It would be just as easy to draw an illustration from the mind and its faculties to prove that seven is one, and one is seven, that black is white, or white is black, as that three is one, and one is three.

In illustration of the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, the Bishop again reverts to the luminary of day. Thus, he says, "It is not denied by any that the orb sends forth the light," and, by a "common figure of speech," might be called "the Father of the light." Here, then, is the Father and the Son. Then "the heat of the sun proceeds from the orb, and likewise from the light," as the Holy Ghost, from the Father and the Son!\* Our readers, we suppose, will expect no commentary on this.

These illustrations can be matched only by some of those we find in the old Fathers. The "disk of the sun, a beam, and light," constituted, according to one of their comparisons, a type of the Trinity. God created man, says one of them, in his own image, that he might exhibit the "mystery of the Trinity" in the human soul, a pattern of himself. Augustine finds an emblem of the same in the "soul, reason, and spirit," and again, in "memory, intellect, and love"; others, in the "soul, its intellect, and its desire," and finally, in the "rational,

---

\* p. 21. The Bishop is consistent in expressing his contempt of metaphysics. "So far as metaphysical objections may be concerned," he says, "we make but small account of them in theology." p. 319. Our readers will by this time have suspected as much. For this, however, he assigns a somewhat curious reason. It is, that "the science of mental philosophy was never in a more unsettled state than at the present moment." An "unsettled state"! Therefore, according to our present conception of the human faculties, and of the fundamental laws of belief, a doctrine may be metaphysically absurd, yet theologically true, since those conceptions may be all erroneous. This is worthy the good African Bishop, who found his faith in a certain part of the doctrine of the Trinity marvellously quickened by the circumstance that the thing to be believed was impossible.

irascible, and concupiscible faculties." Gregory of Nyssa, we believe, claims the credit of the last.

The Bishop flatters himself, that by giving the creeds, and a few other extracts from the remains of the first four centuries, he has established the position that the doctrine of a trinity in unity was uniformly asserted by the earlier Fathers, and he indulges in some rather harsh expressions towards those who deny this position. He charges them with "ignorance and contempt of antiquity"; he is "equally grieved and astonished," he tells us, "by the delusion which affects to discover the anti-trinitarian doctrine in the records of Christian antiquity." "An occasional line, an unguarded expression, or a few garbled extracts," it seems, are all to which those, who "*affect*" to find traces of this doctrine in the writings of the Fathers, are accustomed to appeal!\*

The charge of ignorance of Christian antiquity would come with better grace from almost any other man than from the Bishop of the diocese of Vermont. In truth, he totally misconceives the tenor and spirit of the writings of the period to which he alludes, partly from inattention to the circumstance that the force and signification of terms and phrases perpetually change with time. The meaning of language is in a state of continual mutation, while the written letter remains unaltered. Words, it is well known, are often retained, long after the ideas originally conveyed by them have disappeared, or have become essentially modified. This is especially the case, when the subject, about which they are employed, is attended with any intrinsic obscurity.

The consequences of not attending to this fact are obvious. Terms and expressions occur in an ancient writing, which, according to their modern and obvious use, with which habit has rendered us familiar, suggest to our minds certain ideas, or awaken a particular train of associations. Now, if we take it for granted that these terms and expressions were connected in the mind of the author of the writing with the same ideas and associations, that is, that they were used by him in their present and acquired sense, we shall be liable, it is evident, perpetually to mistake his meaning. To take a comparatively modern instance, the English word *worship*, at the time our present version of the Bible was made, was used to express, not only

---

\* p. 310.

divine homage, but civil respect. This latter meaning is now nearly or quite obsolete. But the word bears this sense several times in our English Bibles, and frequently in the writings of the period to which the translation belongs, and of preceding times. It is easy to see into what blunders, a careless reader, or one acquainted only with the signification of the term as now generally used, and not suspecting it of ever bearing any other, who should sit down to read those writings, would fall, in consequence of this ambiguity of the term.

This is not the only circumstance which has been the occasion of important misapprehensions of the language of the Fathers. Their writings are attended with peculiar obscurity, in consequence of the intellectual habits, and prevailing philosophical systems, of the period at which they were produced. To ascertain an author's meaning with any tolerable exactness, it is often necessary to know something of the modes of thinking and feeling peculiar to his age. If he wrote on theological subjects, it is important to become acquainted with the theological and philosophical opinions of his times, or those which were current in the schools in which he was educated, and among the class of writers whose works constituted his favorite reading.

Now, as the early Fathers, generally, were educated in the schools of the later Platonists, or were strongly tinctured with the opinions of those schools, and borrowed from them several terms, some of which they employed to express the most subtle and obscure ideas which entered into their theology, some acquaintance with the philosophy of the Alexandrian Platonists, as well as with Jewish literature and opinions, becomes absolutely necessary to a correct interpretation of their language. We do not say, that this is the only sort of learning necessary to a right understanding of the Fathers, but this is indispensable, and without it all other is unavailing.

Several expressions in use among Trinitarians of the present day occur in the writings of the Fathers of the second, third, and fourth centuries. Bishop Hopkins all along assumes, that these expressions were used by them in their modern sense. If he will look a little deeper into Christian antiquity, he will find ample evidence that they were employed by the Fathers in a sense widely different from their present.

Take, for example, the terms "unity," "one." Nothing is susceptible of clearer proof than that the Fathers, when they

speak of the Son as one with God, refer not to a numerical, but only to a specific identity, or oneness. All they meant was, that the Son partook of one and the same specific nature with the Father, that is, a divine; just as two individuals of our race partake of one and the same specific nature, that is, a human; divine begetting divine, as human begets human. They never regarded them as constituting numerically one being. Modern Trinitarians use the term as referring to a numerical identity. Of this the Fathers never dreamed. They found no difficulty in calling the Son "God," for, according to the prevailing views of the age, the term did not necessarily imply self-existence. The Son was God, as they explained it, in virtue of his birth, his derivation from the Father, the divine nature being transmitted. So Justin Martyr, speaking of the Son says, "who, since he is the first-begotten *logos* of God, is God."\*

Another term employed in connection with the Trinity, and the use of which tends to mislead, is *hypostasis*, understood by the moderns in the theological sense of *person* as distinguished from substance, but uniformly by the old Fathers in the sense of essence. Thus, when they call the Father and the Son two *hypostases*, they mean two in essence, that is, constituting two real beings.†

Again, the creed of Nice tells us that the Son is *consubstantial*, of the same substance, with the Father. But this term was used by the Fathers not in its modern sense, but in the old Platonic signification, to express, as we have said, specific sameness of nature, sameness of kind, similarity, likeness. The Son was of like nature with the Father, not numerically the same being. So the Fathers of Nice, as Eusebius, in his letter to his people tells us, understood the term. So it was used by the council of Chalcedon, if their language has any consistency; and so Athanasius himself, in his earlier writings, distinctly explains it, taking the examples of a man and a dog. One man, he tells us, is consubstantial with another, and so is one dog; but a dog and a man are not consubstantial.‡

The epithet *eternal*, sometimes applied to the Son, was ambiguous, meaning, as the Fathers sometimes used it, simply

---

\* Apol. I. p. 94. Thirlb.

† See some references on this point in a former Number; Vol. VI. (New Series.) p. 36, note.

‡ See Christian Examiner, Vol. VII. (New Series.) pp. 338-340.

*before the world was.* Whenever, in speaking of the Son, they used it in its strict sense, it was in reference to a notion generally entertained by them, that the Son had, from all eternity, a sort of potential existence in the Father, that is, as an attribute, his *logos*, reason, or wisdom, which, by a voluntary act of the Father a little before the creation, was converted into a real being, and became his instrument in forming the world.

Bishop Hopkins does not discriminate. He throughout goes on the supposition, as we have said, that the language, which occurs in the writings of the Fathers respecting the Father, Son, and Spirit, was uniformly employed by them in its modern and acquired signification.\*

---

\* In his book on the "Primitive Church," the third named at the head of this article, in which he undertakes the defence of Episcopacy, the Bishop manifests the same want of discrimination in regard to the use of terms and expressions. Thus, because the terms *bishop* and *presbyter* occur in ancient Christian writings, he assumes it as a fact that two distinct orders of the priesthood then existed. Yet nothing is capable of clearer proof, than that the terms were at first used indiscriminately to designate one order, and for some time after the term *bishop* came to be appropriated to the first or presiding Presbyter, no such thing as a diocesan Bishop was known. The only existing Bishops were parochial, or congregational Bishops, having charge of a single parish or community of believers, worshipping together in one place, much like our present congregational ministers, who, according to the primitive use of the term, are strictly Bishops, and correspond to the ancient Bishops. See Christian Examiner, Vol. XII. (New Series.) pp. 177 *et seqq.*

Bishop Hopkins has high hierarchical notions, and talks with great complacency of Ecclesiastical Judicatories. His Defence of Episcopacy, however, partakes of most of the defects of his other publications. It is a little more courteous in tone than parts of his book on the "Primitive Creed," but it abounds in flimsy arguments and unsupported assertions, and is written wholly for effect. It is of an exceedingly miscellaneous character, and contains some very just observations, and others which fill us with surprise.

Some of his objections to the efforts made to promote "what is called the Temperance Reform," are curious, and, so far as we know, novel. He starts fairly with the assertion, that, according to his "views of the subject, the Episcopal Church is justified in taking no part in the Temperance Reform." One reason is, that the "Temperance Society" is not a "Christian Society," and is not therefore to be encouraged. p. 132. Then "if the Temperance Society," he says, "should succeed to the extent of its anticipation, *it would be a triumph to infidelity.*" — "It would demonstrate what the Infidel has always been asserting, that *Christianity is not of God.*" p. 138. Now we do not, any more than Bishop Hopkins, approve *all* the measures adopted to promote the Reform, but

The current language (not occasionally an "unguarded expression") of all the Ante-Nicene Fathers, understood according to correct principles of interpretation, shows that they held the Son to be inferior to the Father and a distinct being from him, and the Nicene creed teaches no other doctrine. It is not our purpose at present to exhibit the evidence from the writings of the Fathers in proof of this statement. This has been attempted in some former numbers of our journal, the references to which we give below.\*

The Bishop's confident assertion that the early Fathers were sound on the subject of the Trinity, according to modern apprehensions of the doctrine, is worth just about as much as his assertion, equally confident, relating to the origin of the Apostles' Creed. Others, sound Trinitarians too, and perfectly competent from their learning to decide, state the matter differently. Will Bishop Hopkins charge Petavius, author of the *Dogmata Theologica*, with ignorance of Christian antiquity? Was Huet, bishop of Avranches, and author of the *Origeniana*,

---

we confess it never occurred to us, that, should these measures succeed in making all men sober and temperate, Christianity would thereby be endangered.

\* See articles on Justin Martyr, Origen, and Arius and Arianism, particularly, (New Series,) Vol. II. pp. 303 — 327, Vol. VI. pp. 23 — 40, and Vol VII. pp. 299 — 344.

The Trinity of the Fathers differed from the modern doctrine, in the following particulars: First, as regards the Father and Son, they asserted, in the first place, the real subordination and inferiority of the latter to the former in his whole nature. As a real person, or individual being, they did not, in the second place, hold the proper eternity of the Son, though they believed that, as an attribute or property of the Father, which in their view he originally was, he had always subsisted, since there never was a time when the Father was without reason, wisdom, *logos*. In the third place, they did not admit that the Son was numerically the same being with the Father, but only of the same specific or common nature, that is, divine, being not God himself, but by birth and derivation like him, as a human being is like the parent, or of like nature with him, in this sense, consubstantial. In regard to the Spirit, the difference was still greater.

Of this disparity, admitted by learned Trinitarians, the Bishop takes no notice. Yet, until it can be disproved, it is an abuse of language, a fallacy, a gross imposition, to affirm that the Fathers bear uniform testimony to the Trinity. To prove this, it is necessary to show, not merely that the expressions still current on the subject are found in the writings of the early Fathers, but that these expressions were used by them in the sense they now bear among approved Trinitarians, a task which has never yet been accomplished, and never will be.

ignorant? Was Cudworth ignorant? Yet with these, and several others we could name, good Trinitarians too, the Bishop of Vermont, if he will condescend to read them, will find himself directly at issue.

Petavius adduces a great mass of evidence to show that the most distinguished of the Fathers, before the council of Nice, taught the inferiority of the Son to the Father, and of the Spirit to the Son.\*

"Certainly," says Huet, "Tatian, and an older than Tatian, Justin, taught erroneous views of the Trinity." Theophilus of Antioch, he says, "falls under the same censure." With others it was still worse. "For," he continues, "things shameful and not to be endured were uttered by Tertullian and Lactantius, as also by Clement, Dionysius, and Pierius of Alexandria, and many others." When Bellarmine, he says still further, "defends Origen on the ground that, his preceptor Clement, and his disciples Dionysius of Alexandria and Gregory Thaumaturgus, being sound and orthodox, we are authorized to infer that the same doctrine which he received from Clement, he himself held and transmitted to his followers, he could have said nothing more injurious to the cause of Origen, for no one of the three held the Trinity in its purity and integrity. For Clement so distinguished between the substance of the Father and that of the Son as to make the latter inferior, and Dionysius said the Son was a creation (work) of the Father, and dissimilar to him, and spake unbecomingly of the Spirit, as we are told by Basil, who also censures Gregory Thaumaturgus for teaching plainly that the Son was created." "Finally," he says, "it is evident, that not indeed in the days of Basil, and even in times more recent, did the Catholics dare openly profess the divinity of the Spirit."†

We might multiply quotations of a similar import from modern Trinitarian writers, whom it will not do for Dr. Hopkins to charge with ignorance of antiquity.‡ Several of the

---

\* See, particularly, *De Trinitate*, Lib. I. c. 3, 4, 5. Bishop Hopkins says, that Petavius, as a Catholic, was interested in depressing the ancient Fathers, as the Protestants made use of them in the Popish controversy. The Bishop must be aware that this is not to refute him.

† Huet. *Orig. Lib. II. Qu. 2, § 10.*

‡ Professor Stuart has recently made some statements on this subject, which, coming from such a source, are worthy of notice, and we

Fathers themselves, and some of those to whom he has appealed as authorities, are against him; for they roundly tax the more ancient Fathers, to whom he also appeals, with unsoundness on the subject of the Trinity. One of his authorities is Origen. We have seen what Huet thought of him. Jerome thought no better; for he accuses him of asserting that the Son

---

commend them to the attention of the Bishop. They occur in the articles on Schleiermacher, in the numbers of the "Biblical Repository and Quarterly Observer" for April and July, 1825. They are at variance with the Professor's former statements relating to the opinions of the early Fathers. He thinks them more accurate, as they are the result of a more intimate acquaintance with the writings of the Fathers. The views of the Nicene Fathers, he tells us, "if he understands them," do "really and effectually interfere with the true equality in substance, power, and glory, of the three persons or distinctions in the Godhead." The Son and Spirit, he says, according to them, are derived beings, and derivation implies inferiority. "A derived God," he says, "cannot be a self-existent God." The *numerical* identity of the Father and Son, he affirms, was not a doctrine of the ancient Fathers. "Justin," he observes, "says in so many words that the *logos* (Son) is different from the Father, and *another in number*." In regard to the unity and distinction of the Father and Son, he says, the "zeal of Origen led him to a theory in no important respect better than that of Arius." "Such was the case, too, with Eusebius the historian," and "Dionysius names the Son a *creation* and *work* of the Father." The council of Nice, he says, according to Athanasius, "did not mean to assert the *numerical* unity of the Godhead," and much more to the same purpose. The result is, that the Fathers generally, before and at the council of Nice, asserted the Son to be inferior to the Father, and *numerically* a different being from him. So says Professor Stuart!

We are aware that the Professor is no favorite with the Bishop. He is accused by him of recommending "the ministers of Christ to study the most revolting and impious writers of the German school," while he takes credit to himself "for the language of absolute contempt" towards the ancient Fathers, and of sundry other heinous offences, one of which is a disposition, imbibed from those same Germans, to "make concessions for which he receives no acknowledgment either from friend or foe!" The Bishop thinks, that, if the Professor had studied the German theology less, and the Fathers more, "the change would have been in favor of his soundness and learning, — his strength and power," and "he probably would have wielded a weapon against error, of far higher temper and keener edge," and "there would have been none of his present disregard, not to say contempt, for the learning and judgment of the Fathers, and the authority of the Primitive Church!"

It is somewhat diverting to hear the Bishop of Vermont gravely lecturing Professor Stuart on his ignorance of the writings of the Fathers. We do not suppose, that the Professor surpasses all that are, or have been, in the accuracy and extent of his knowledge of those writings, nor do we know that he claims for himself any such distinction. But

was "not begotten, but made." \* The Bishop quotes and extols Basil the Great. What was Basil's opinion of the Ante-Nicene Fathers? What he says of Dionysius and Gregory Thaumaturgus, another of the Bishop's authorities, has been just quoted. Of Dionysius he says further, that he "sowed the seeds of the Anomœan (Arian) impiety; for he not only made a diversity of persons between the Father and the Son, but a difference of essence, taking away their consubstantiality." The same Basil admits, that the old Fathers were "silent" on the question of the Spirit; and says, that they who acknowledged its divinity in his day were "condemned as introducing novel dogmas on the subject." Rufinus accuses Clement of Alexandria of calling the Son a "creature," and Dionysius, he says, "in his zeal against Sabellianism, fell into Arianism." Origen admits, that there might be a few in his day who pronounced the Saviour to be "God over all," but this, he expressly tells us they did rashly, and that it was by no means the common sentiment. "Grant," says he, "that among the multitude of believers there are some, who, differing from others, rashly affirm the Saviour to be God over all; we do not acknowledge him as such, for we believe him when he said, 'The Father, who sent me, is greater than I.' "† This, Origen, as did the Ante-Nicene Fathers, we believe, without exception, understood as spoken of Christ's whole, or superior nature.

Such (and we might add to the number) are some of the authorities among the Fathers in direct opposition to the Bishop. Were these Fathers "ignorant of Christian antiquity?" They were themselves ancient, "primitive," according to the Bishop's standard. Have they then borne false witness of each other and of themselves? This supposition is hardly consistent with the title to exalted veneration the Bishop so freely accords to them.‡

---

we should like to see the Bishop measure strength with him in a contest requiring the use of weapons drawn from the armory of the Fathers. If we do not greatly mistake, the author of the "Primitive Creed Examined and Explained" would, in a very short time, find himself unhorsed.

\* Epist. 59. Ad Avitum.

† Adv. Cels. Lib. 8.

‡ It is amusing to find, that Bishop Hopkins, quoting Eusebius the historian, as an undoubted Trinitarian, and quoting too from his Letter to his people from Nice, which, if it is to be trusted (and it is confirmed in the main by the testimony of Athanasius), shows that neither Euse-

The Bishop is not more fortunate in his appeal to councils. They all, if we may believe him, including the Arian and the Semi-Arian of the fourth century, bear testimony in his favor. He specifies several. First, the second council of Antioch, holden A. D. 341. But this council expressly declared against the Nicene faith, rejected the term *consubstantial*, and in favor of their own views appealed to the testimony of antiquity.\* The term was rejected also from the creed of the third council of Sirmium, which, says Du Pin, is Arian, but which Hosius, long one of the pillars of the Nicene faith, in an evil hour, as the orthodox will have it, signed. Sad fall indeed. It was anathematized by the council of Philippopolis; condemned by that of Antioch holden soon after; by the fifth of Sirmium; by those of Seleucia and Ariminum (Rimini), and others. In regard to the council of Ariminum the Bishop's statement is as trustworthy as usual. He says, that, notwithstanding the efforts of the Arians, and the "influence of the Emperor, and the apprehension of banishment and persecution," the four hundred Bishops assembled there "determined to adhere to the Nicene confession, and solemnly republished it as the symbol of the Catholic faith."† And yet, notwithstanding their "determination," and their "republication," if the Bishop will have it so, "of the Nicene confession," it is quite certain that these Bishops generally, before the council broke up, did recede from the determination, violate their constancy, and sign a creed of a very different import, being one recently drawn up at Sirmium, in opposition to the Nicene symbol. Du Pin says, that "*all* the bishops signed," and thus, says he, "ended this council, whose beginning was glorious, and end deplorable."‡

And yet Bishop Hopkins is not ashamed to ask "the enemies of Trinitarians to point out only one council which

---

bis nor the council were orthodox in the modern sense of the term. Eusebius was in no good repute for orthodoxy among the Fathers. "An Arian," says Athanasius; the "Prince of Arians," exclaims Jerome; "an Arian, and worse than an Arian," adds Nicephorus. For some remarks on this subject, see *Christian Examiner*, Vol. XIII. (New Series.) pp. 98, 99.

\* Soc. Lib. II. c. 10. Soz. Lib. III. c. 5.

† p. 310.

‡ History of Eccles. Writers, Vol. II. p. 264. To the time of the abovementioned council Jerome refers, when he says, the whole world groaned to find itself Arian.

adopted their sentiments." That the council of Rimini before its close, and others just named, and more we might mention, were Anti-trinitarian, we want no better evidence than the fact that they openly declared against the Nicene creed, and uniformly condemned and rejected from their symbols the term *consubstantial*, which had been from the first exceedingly obnoxious to the Arians, but which the orthodox made the very watchword of their party. If the Bishop, by appealing to the Arians as testifying in favor of the Trinity, really means to intimate that they held the doctrine in a form satisfactory to him, it is all very well. We will not contend with him on that point. But if the Arian doctrine differs from the orthodox, to what purpose this appeal to the authority of the Arians? It is wholly deceptive. The Bishop may be satisfied with Arian expositions, but they cannot nevertheless be considered as expositions of the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. Of his Trinity they may.\*

We will follow the Bishop no further in his book of the "Primitive Creed Examined and Explained." Several of his remaining statements are no nearer the truth, and no better substantiated, than those already noticed. We have given our readers a sufficient specimen of the contents of the volume, and have said enough, we trust, to show the sort of credit to which the author's assertions are entitled, and the admirable modesty evinced by him in charging all who differ from him.

---

\* The Arians, it seems, believed in a Trinity! Undoubtedly they did. And so do we. But not a trinity in unity; nor did they. We believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and so did they. But we do not believe that these three are numerically one or equal; nor did they, nor any of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Though these Fathers held language respecting the Father and the Son of which the Arians disapproved, they stopped short, as we have before said, of the doctrine of the numerical identity of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. We challenge Dr. Hopkins to produce a single writer of any note, during the first three ages, who held this doctrine.

We beg to assure the Bishop, however, that we do not consider the Athanasian creed as evidence of the faith of *primitive* antiquity exactly, though he is pleased to give it as such, transcribing damnatory clauses and all. He quotes it as a genuine relic of antiquity, and means that his readers shall believe that it is really a production of Athanasius himself. He roundly asserts that it was "published at Rome, A. D. 340"! Of this there is not the least shadow of proof, the statements of Baronius and some other Romish writers of the same stamp being wholly unsupported. Neither Athanasius, nor any writer of his own or of the next century, ever alludes to it in any of their writings now

respecting the opinions of the earlier Fathers, with "ignorance and contempt of antiquity."

In regard to the "Discourses on the Evidences," the second work, the title of which is given at the head of the present article, a word must suffice. The Bishop's motive in the publication is unquestionably good, but there is nothing either in the matter or style which gives it any decided claim to approbation. It is not particularly adapted to meet the wants of the age, and it contains several erroneous statements, which may have been the result of accident, but which we confess have strongly the appearance of design. Like some of those already noticed in the volume on the "Creed," they wear too much the aspect of "pious frauds," as they are termed, which, whatever may have been thought of them in former times, will hardly, we suppose, be openly defended, at the present day, as useful for the edification of the Christian, or the conversion of the infidel. Some of them are very gross.

It is painful to be under the necessity of calling attention to statements of the kind alluded to. We regret exceedingly to meet them in treatises designed to set forth the evidences of our faith, for by means of them religion is wounded in the house of its friends. No cause can be permanently benefited by arguments which rest on falsehood as their basis. Truth and sincerity are the only weapons we may lawfully use. As long as we can wield these, let us contend, but not one moment longer; for no longer will Christ own us as his true champions, or heaven's blessing crown our arms.

We cannot take leave of the author of the works, which

---

extant. No mention of it occurs of a date prior to the sixth century, and some of the writings in which we find the earliest allusions to it are of doubtful genuineness. In regard to Athanasius, says Du Pin, "all the world agrees it was none of his, but of some authors who lived a long time after him. — It is certain, that it was composed after the council of Chalcedon," A. D. 451. (*Hist. Eccles. Writers*, Vol. IV. pp. 35, 36.) "That which is called the creed of Athanasius," says Pretzman, "certainly was not written by that Father." "It was never heard of till the 6th century, above a hundred years after the death of Athanasius." "It cannot now be ascertained who was its real author; — it had never the sanction of any council." — (*Elements of Christian Theology*, Vol. II. p. 219.) It was "the composition," says Dr. Samuel Clarke, "of an uncertain obscure author, written (not certainly known whether) in Greek or Latin, in one of the darkest and most ignorant ages of the church." (*Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 447, ed. Lond. 1712.)

have called forth our present remarks, without expressing our chagrin and mortification, that writers, belonging to a reputable profession, and wearing some external badges of distinction in that profession, should continue to give to the public, productions, exhibiting so little evidence of theological learning, correct taste, or habits of clear and forcible reasoning. Their appearance certainly is not creditable to the theological literature of our country. Their publication, from time to time, leads us occasionally to doubt whether the progress in just principles of biblical criticism and interpretation, of which some of our theological seminaries, and the writings of a few individuals among us, give abundant proof, is shared by any large portion of our religious teachers, or whether the public is yet to any very wide extent benefited by such progress, whatever it be. It would be difficult to point out a passage in the writings which have been just now under consideration, in which the author has been indebted for a single excellence, to the efforts of the human mind in theology, criticism, or historical research, for the last hundred years. In regard to solidity and justness of thought, learning, arrangement, style, and general fairness and candor, his productions are far inferior to those of Pearson and Barrow on the Creed, Paley on the Evidences, and others of a similar character which might be named. When the Bishop, in reference to the remark often made, that the best Trinitarian critics now generally admit that the occurrence, in the Old Testament, of one of the names of the Deity in the plural form, proves nothing as to a plurality of persons in the Divinity, says that it is "questionable whether this point *is* generally conceded," and "more than questionable whether it ever ought to be," he furnishes, we think, a key to the course he is determined to pursue, that is, to surrender not the least particle of the traditionary opinions which make in his favor, though they should be proved, with the clearness of mathematical demonstration, to be utterly repugnant to reason and fact. On no other principle can we explain his adherence to the old fabulous accounts of the origin of the Apostles' and the Athanasian Creeds, and the numerous other vestiges, constantly recurring in his writings, of antiquated hypotheses, and worn-out and exploded absurdities.

A. L.

ART. VI.—*On the Penitentiary System in the United States, and its Application in France ; with an Appendix on Penal Colonies, and also Statistical Notes.* By G. DE BEAUMONT and A. DE TOCQUEVILLE, Counsellors in the Royal Court of Paris, and Members of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Translated from the French, with an Introduction, Notes, and Additions. By FRANCIS LIEBER. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, & Blanchard. 1833. 8vo. pp. 301.

It is consoling, when one has been contemplating the mischiefs, the follies, the guilt, and the suffering, which abound in the world, to turn the thoughts to those symptoms of improvement in the state of society, which here and there may be discerned. It is a consolation which is necessary for the encouragement of such as are willing to contribute their share of labor in advancing the best interests of their fellow men ; for, if it be otherwise, if, in spite of effort and the use of reasonable means, there is no improvement ; if, as we are sometimes told, the world grows worse and worse, more and more accomplished in the arts of corruption, and less disposed to what is really and permanently good, why should any one persevere in the hopeless task ? Why should we toil for those who cannot, will not, be benefited ? This is the natural tendency of those assertions and arguments we sometimes hear from men, who think themselves profound observers, and who do not hesitate to assure you, that, when you have attained equal experience and wisdom with themselves, you will be satisfied that the progress of the world is nothing more than an improvement of physical condition arising rather from the operation of selfishness than any higher motive, and that in all moral qualities we are far inferior to those who preceded us, and that our children will, in all probability, be worse than ourselves ;

“ *Ætas parentum, pejor avis, tulit  
Nos nequiores, mox daturos  
Progeniem vitiosiore.*”

For ourselves, we think with very little reverence of the philosophy which leads to such conclusions. It is always easier to find fault than to discern merit. When we hear a critic haranguing on the defects of a work of art, we cannot but

suspect him of not being able to understand or appreciate the talent displayed in it; and for the same reason, when we hear a philosopher descanting on the increasing evil in the world, we are inclined to ascribe it, in part at least, to his incapacity to see or comprehend the better tendencies of our nature. We are not going to launch upon the boundless ocean of discussion on the comparative state of society at different periods; but we have been led to the thought we have expressed, by what we must regard as a remarkable instance of the spirit of moral as well as physical improvement in the present age. When before, in the history of the world, was a mission sent from the government of one powerful nation to another, to examine, not the dock-yards, the manufactures, or munitions of war, not into the sources of revenue or system of taxation, but into the condition of the most degraded class of the community, those who have heretofore been beneath the reach of the sympathy of even the meanest member of the community? How long is it since the condition of the prisoner has been thought worthy anybody's attention beside his keeper's? Shall we go back to the unsophisticated virtue of Roman, Grecian, Egyptian, or Hindoo antiquity, to recover traces of the humanity which our own age has lost? Or shall we learn a lesson from the still ruder, untaught kindness of the savage, whose customs have descended from an era of unmeasured remoteness? Or is this seemingly philanthropic mission only another form of the selfishness so universal? Do people wish to find out the most effectual system of imprisonment in order merely that themselves may live in greater security? When selfishness takes this shape of prudent forecast, of regard for the welfare of the many, and of justice without cruelty to the guilty, we are ready to call it a virtue of a high order. It is the same sort of selfishness which makes us desire the happiness arising from any right conduct, and which we wish to see increasing and extending perpetually. It is, moreover, highly creditable to this country, that it should be looked up to by foreigners as taking the lead in the reform of prison discipline, and that commissioners should be sent hither by a people among the most forward in all points of civilization, to make inquiries on the spot into the character of our penitentiary institutions, with a view to the improvement of their own.

The report drawn up by Messrs. de Beaumont and de  
VOL. XX. — 3D S. VOL. II. NO. III. 48

Tocqueville is a document of much value ; for it states facts and gives authorities for assertions, and thus enables one to come to results which may or may not agree with those of the authors. It does not display, so far as we could discover in perusal, much previous practical acquaintance with the subject. We doubt if the writers were familiar with the condition of the imprisoned criminal or debtor in their own country, before their appointment to inquire into the treatment of such persons here. They come to the subject with an air of freshness, which is, perhaps, no injury to the unprejudiced fairness of their views ; and they talk often with a respect for theories, which a little wider practical knowledge might have materially affected. They obviously possess the best and kindest feelings, and the soundest views as to the general object to be effected by what is called Prison Discipline ; but this is a matter in which, as in many others, it is not enough to wish to do right. The wisdom of the wisest will not be superfluous, nor the brotherly kindness of the most benevolent thrown away upon it. It is full of difficulties still, difficulties arising from the different views men take of the objects to be attained and sought by it, and the different means they are disposed to adopt for the accomplishment of those objects ; as well as on account of the general want of interest in the condition of a degraded class of human beings, and the incredulity which very much prevails still, as to the amount of usefulness of the whole system.

If you ask what is the object of punishment, one will answer, to deprive the criminal of the power of repeating his offence ; another will say, to deter others from the commission of crime ; a third, simply, the security of society, without much regard to the means ; and a fourth, the amendment of the guilty. Our answer to the question would be, the prevention of crime, in the widest possible sense of the words ; its prevention for the future, as well in the convicted culprit himself as in all others. There are two objects to be attained, the one having reference to those within the walls of the prison, the other to those without. To affect the latter, the punishment must be severe enough to be dreaded ; to affect the former, its severity must be tempered with so much of mildness as will prevent it from being of a hardening, brutalizing character. Nor should we stop here. Punishment should have a tendency to improve men, not to make them worse, nor keep them precisely where

they are. Then comes the great question, What are the best means of improving persons of such character as usually become inmates of prisons? In order to determine the proper answer to this, it is manifest that the first necessary preliminary is an acquaintance with the character of those to be influenced. Upon this point the greatest, the most fundamental, and most pernicious errors have been everywhere committed. Convicts have been considered as all of one character, and that the most hardened and degraded possible; as if nothing but total depravity could lead men to the commission of crime; as if offences against the laws of man were of so much deeper dye than those violations of the laws of God which escape the penitentiary; as if the power of sudden and strong temptation never led astray those who were prevailingly well-disposed; as if ignorance, and neglect, and bad company ought to have the same effect on the youthful mind, as instruction, care, and kind friends, and should be no excuse for the commission of offences the enormity of which the poor culprit was utterly incapable of appreciating; as if any man had a right to such confidence in his own righteousness, as to feel sure he might not have fallen as low under similar circumstances; or even, if that confidence were justifiable, as if he had a right, on that account, to shut out his fellow being from sympathy, and to harden himself against all feeling of another's infirmity.

The truth is, and happily it is a truth beginning to be felt and acknowledged, that there is a similar diversity of character to be found within the prison that exists outside of it; though, from the imperfection of human institutions, all are subjected alike to a uniform punishment. There is the young man, with habits not yet fixed in wrong, neglected perhaps, ignorant, and deserving rather compassion than harshness; there is the weak tool of another's cunning; the reckless, headlong reveller, suddenly stopped in his heedless course; there is the man of strong passions, and the victim of an almost national vice; as well as the cool, resolute villain, and the old, hardened, hopeless reprobate. But we take back the last epithet. No one is hopeless. As long as human nature remains as it is, some hidden corner of the blackest heart, if it can but be reached, will be found susceptible of good. The number of those who have "grown old in sin, and hardened in their crimes," is comparatively small; the majority of prisoners are young enough to have their characters materially affected by the circum-

stances under which they are placed, and the influences which may be brought to bear upon them. It is very certain, that, on the old systems of punishment, prisoners were made infinitely worse by the evil communications to which they were exposed. "*Corrumpere et corrumpi*" was the regular occupation of the jail, the galley, the penitentiary of former times; and is it credible, that any human being is capable of being made worse, and incapable of being made better? Can a young man be perverted by one course of education and example, and can he not be affected at all by an opposite influence? Let it be tried. Let the prisoner be brought, as far as possible, into a sound state of body, by wholesome diet, pure air, sufficient clothing, hard but not oppressive labor, and personal cleanliness. Then let all communications of evil be stopped, and all of good opened which it is practicable to give, and let this continue for several years; and then we shall be able to judge, whether some portion of ignorance may or may not be removed, whether some of those perverted hearts can or cannot be reclaimed, and whether or not any human being can be found absolutely incapable of improvement.

The experiment surely is worth trying; as no one will deny that the criminal and the prisoner make up an important class in the community, and few will doubt that the promise of good results is sufficiently encouraging to authorize the attempt. Nay, the experiment has been tried, and has already produced results that have greatly encouraged those who have interested themselves in the subject. Those corrupting communications, which effected so much mischief, have been prevented by requiring seclusion and silence. The health of the prisoner has been cared for, in all the circumstances of situation, exercise, clothing, and diet; religious instruction, both public and private, has been given, and the deplorable ignorance of many has been in some degree removed by enabling them to read; and the Bible has been furnished to all, and prayer and exhortation, and reproof and encouragement, have exerted their combined influences on all. And what has been the effect? Far greater and better than was anticipated by the judicious friends of the plan. Not a few insulated cases merely of improvement of character have occurred; but a much larger proportion than was expected to be reclaimed has been found greatly benefited. To not a few, their commitment to prison has been, under Providence, the means of purifying and ele-

vating them from vice, poverty, and ignorance, to respectability, comfort, and knowledge, and even the most obdurate have acquired habits of great value to themselves and others. What has been done may be repeated; and the importance of these improvements of character, and real reformatations, cannot be too highly estimated, even if they be reckoned at the lowest number that any, the most incredulous, would fix. Compare this scheme with those of other times and other countries, with the cruelty, the neglect, the filth, the degrading and brutalizing vices, the insufficient food, and the foul air, to which the prisoner has been heretofore exposed, and shall we not rejoice at the change? When to these facts we add the important alteration in the expense of establishments for the imprisonment of criminals, when we learn that prisoners, instead of being a great and growing burden on the community, are actually a source of gain, we are ready to ask, is not this system precisely what we want? Would it not be chimerical to expect any thing better? Can there, indeed, be any thing better of the sort?

Yes, say Messrs. de Beaumont and de Tocqueville, there is one thing better; there is still an improvement on this plan; and that is, the absolute solitude of every individual confined, at least his absolute separation from every other prisoner. Let him see no one but his keeper, or a minister of the gospel; and let him reflect, in his cell, upon his past course and his future prospects; but, that his reflections may not be too intense, give him employment; and he will come out not only a better man, but with the advantage of not having been seen, known, and marked as a convict either by his associates or others. He will not, therefore, be exposed either to the temptations or the discouragements which await those who have not been in total solitude. It is found by experience, that nothing has a stronger tendency to soften the hard, stubborn, vicious character than absolute seclusion; and that is precisely the point to be obtained with the convict; while to those who know the difficulties to be encountered by the discharged prisoner, even if well disposed, — the temptations, the sneers of his old associates, and the abhorrence expressed by respectable people for an inmate of the State Prison, few things will seem more important than the protection of the unhappy convict from their oppressive power.

This experiment, too, has been tried. It was already begun when Messrs. de Beaumont and de Tocqueville were here in

1831 ; and so promising were its apparent advantages, that the plan received their decided approbation. Five years' experience since that time, has added to our acquaintance with this scheme and its effects ; and we propose now to inquire whether those effects are, or can probably be made, so superior to those of the Auburn plan, as to justify the preference expressed for it by our authors, at the vast additional cost which it necessarily implies. We admit, as fully as can be desired, the advantages enjoyed by the prisoner discharged from the Philadelphia penitentiary of not having been known as its inmate. He is, as it were, new-born into the world ; and, with his faculties fully developed, he has a new character to acquire ; and it is his own fault if he do not adhere to the good resolutions he may have formed in his cell, and become thenceforward a useful citizen. But we think even this advantage, great as it is, may be purchased too dearly ; and we are free to confess our opinion that the objections to the plan more than counterbalance this solitary point of superiority.

The first and most important defect in the scheme of constant confinement, is the impossibility of giving adequate religious instruction ; we use these words advisedly, — the *impossibility* of giving *adequate* religious instruction. There is, probably, no equal number of human beings in civilized communities, who stand more in need of religious instruction, and of religious influence, in every possible shape, than the convicts in our penitentiaries. It was the want of this influence upon their minds in youth, which brought many of them, we are almost ready to say, all of them, to the cells they occupy ; and without this influence it is in vain to hope for any valuable change in their characters. We agree perfectly with a remark of the warden of the Philadelphia Penitentiary in his last Report. "On few points have the community been more mistaken than in the character of convicts ; who are, as a mass, an unfortunate, uneducated, ignorant class of beings, victims of intemperance and neglect. There are some instances among them of low cunning, but few of intelligence. A small number have received the first rudiments of a school education ; *but the great majority, indeed nearly the whole, have been destitute of any thing like a moral or religious training.*" No wonder, then, that they are where they are, and what they are. Unhappy children of unnatural parents, it may still be a

mercy to them to become inmates of a cell, if the light of religion may there be poured on their darkened minds; if a faithful and wise teacher is allowed the means and opportunity of awaking, enlightening, exhorting, alarming, encouraging them, touching their hitherto insensible hearts with new emotions, sympathizing with them in their penitence, and raising their thoughts to Him whom, hitherto, they have not known in all their ways. None have so great need of such teachings, in all the various ways in which they can be given. The preaching of the word, the Sabbath school, the united prayer, and the private exhortation should all be regularly and diligently used. Too much cannot be done, and in neglecting any of these means of grace there is a loss not merely to the prisoner, but to society, which cannot be repaid in any other way. Now does the plan of the Philadelphia Penitentiary admit of the use of all these means? Manifestly not. The prisoners cannot be assembled for common instruction, either in the chapel or the Sabbath school. Whatever is done for them in that respect must be done by individual communication, or, at least, by the voice of a clergyman heard in the long passages through the small holes cut into the cells. — In this way, thirty-six prisoners at once may, perhaps, hear the words addressed to an invisible audience; but no one can tell whether the prisoner chooses to listen or not.

And how is this amount of labor to be performed? On the 1st of January, 1836, there were three hundred and forty-four prisoners in the Penitentiary, thirty-six of whom only were in such situation as by any possibility to hear the same exhortation at the same time.\* Is it expected of a clergyman to preach ten sermons on a Sabbath? Or are ten clergymen to be appointed to do what might be so much better done by one? We say better done, for it is past our belief that any man, however fervent and faithful, can preach to stone walls with holes in them, with the same efficacy as to a living assembly who will show in their countenances the effect of his words

---

\* We are aware that a second story of cells has been built in some of the wings, by which the number is doubled. The intention was to give each prisoner two rooms, and so retain only the same number of convicts; but if this purpose has been changed, and a prisoner is placed in each cell, the number who may listen at once will be increased to seventy-two. The argument against the construction will still remain sufficiently strong.

on their hearts. And supposing a man to be found self-denying enough to undertake such a task, how long could he preach two sermons, or one sermon, in a week to all the prisoners? We really marvel at the coolness with which the Board of Inspectors, in their last Report, urge upon the legislature the appointment of a religious *instructor* for the Eastern Penitentiary. They say truly, that "the benefits of the system cannot be fully and completely exhibited without a systematic course of religious instruction." We think so too; and we think also that such instruction cannot be given in the Eastern Penitentiary, unless an officiating clergyman is appointed for each corridor, or the system of perpetual seclusion is given up, and the prisoners are assembled in a chapel. Believing, as we do, that religious instruction is indispensable to any valuable scheme of prison discipline, we unhesitatingly prefer that plan by which it may be and is given, according to which every prisoner may hear one or two sermons on the Sabbath, may have the benefit of the Sabbath school or Bible class, and may listen to daily prayers, to that on which all this is impracticable except at a cost, and with an apparatus, which only adds ridicule to impracticability.

The next point to which we wish to direct attention is the comparative healthiness of the two systems. Next in importance to the health of the soul is that of the body; and we should think it impossible to doubt, that the perpetual confinement to a small room is less healthy than active employment in the open air. We know that in the Appendix to the work of our authors, detailing their conversations with prisoners in this penitentiary, the improvement in their health is frequently mentioned, as it is also in every report of the officers of the institution. We have not the least doubt of it; but neither are we in the least satisfied by it. Health may be improved without becoming good; and it may be and often is what is called good health, or freedom from positive disease, when the subject is in that nervous, feeble, spiritless condition, showing any thing rather than what we should be disposed to call a sound, vigorous state of the body. The constant dwelling on the subject in all reports shows how great and natural a source of anxiety it has been to the patrons of the institution. Indeed it could not be otherwise. Everybody knows that confinement and sedentary occupations are not favorable to health. Look at those who are in better situations than the

convict; the mechanic, whose occupation confines him chiefly to one room, the shoemaker, the engraver, the artist, the student. Are they generally what would be called persons of good health; or are they commonly spoken of as delicate and feeble? Are they obliged to take great care of themselves, and are they frequently the victims of dyspepsia and consumption? None of these persons are necessarily confined to one room, twelve feet by eight; few of them sleep in their shops or their studies; none of them are compelled to use the same apartment for all purposes; yet they are generally delicate. How must it be with the prisoner, then, who eats, sleeps, and labors in the same little room? Is it possible for the air to be pure? Is it possible, that foulness should be entirely excluded? We do not ask these questions because we feel any doubt on the point. We have the best evidence, evidence on which we would believe any thing which human testimony is capable of establishing, that the atmosphere of those apartments is sometimes at least oppressive, and almost intolerable to those not accustomed to it. Is this right? Is this good for the health? Is this bad air, and generally sedentary occupation, as good for the prisoner as wielding the stone-hammer, the spade, or the pick-axe, in the open air? It certainly is very possible, that the average mortality may not exceed that of other prisons, and that the prisoner may live thus for a great length of time without becoming violently ill, especially when a careful system of diet is pursued; but he will necessarily fall into a state of what we should call low, rather than high health; and the produce of his day's labor will be very different from what it would be, were he more robust. The state of the mind is so associated with that of the body, that if the latter be debilitated, the former will be so too; and we may be producing, by our system of punishment, that weakness of character which will destroy the value of any reformation.

There is another point, connected with this of the healthiness of perpetual seclusion, on which we wish to speak guardedly and tenderly; but cannot suffer ourselves to pass it entirely over, particularly as we are reminded of it by every report from that prison. It is well known that solitary confinement, without occupation, has a strong tendency to produce insanity. It is a punishment greater than men can bear. Does the introduction of labor entirely remove that tendency? It is contended by the patrons of the scheme, that it does; and we

hope it may be so. We should, *à priori*, have some doubts on the point; and we will confess, that those doubts are not yet entirely removed. In the last report of the warden, there is a suggestion regarding the inmates of prisons generally, which we cannot but suspect took something of its tone from his personal observation in that particular prison. He says, many more of such persons, than is generally supposed, are really irresponsible, being either idiots or lunatics. Is it certain that the system of perpetual seclusion has no effect in increasing their number? We wish that all doubt on this point might be removed; for insanity is too dreadful an infliction to be suffered, as an effect of a plan for restoring to soundness the mind diseased by vice and crime. We desire to express ourselves clearly on the subject. There is no positive evidence before us, that insanity has been actually caused by the system pursued in the Philadelphia penitentiary; our doubts arise from the well-known fact, that it has been caused by seclusion without labor, and from our being unable to believe, without strong testimony to the fact, that labor alone is a sufficient antidote to the mental poison of perpetual solitude. If the directors of the prison can give us unequivocal proof of the safety of the plan with regard to this point, we shall rejoice that our speculative doubts are dispelled by the best of teachers, experience.

We come now to the consideration of a branch of the subject, of less importance than what we have spoken of, but still of sufficient weight to deserve serious attention in comparing the merits of the two systems. We should not, of course, place the pecuniary results of one in the scale against the more favorable moral results of the other; but when we find, that the plan, which, in our view, is best adapted to the success of the best influences, physical and intellectual, is also attended with very superior economical results, we confess that we think it an addition of no small importance to its merits. The earnings of the labor of all prisons conducted on the Auburn plan have been great; in most cases, more than sufficient to pay all expenses, including the salaries of the officers. The earnings of the prisoners at the Philadelphia penitentiary have thus far been by no means so satisfactory. According to the last Report of the President of the Board of Inspectors, the deficit for the year 1835 was \$5,000, besides the salaries of the officers. It does not appear what the salaries amounted to; but the profits of the labor of an average of about two hundred

and eighty prisoners were \$12,530·31, or about \$44 each. In the Massachusetts State Prison, the earnings of the prisoners, last year, amounted to the sum of \$37,707·48, or \$135·66 each. The President, in his report, suggests to the legislature the propriety of furnishing capital to supply the means of purchasing materials, &c. On the system at present pursued, we fear the only result of such a step would be, that the expenses of the prison would be increased by the interest on that capital, whatever it might be.

But the difference between the two schemes does not arise merely from the difference in the results of the labor of the prisoners. The necessary expenses are very different also. We assert this without fear of contradiction, notwithstanding we have never seen, in any report of the Philadelphia penitentiary, a detailed statement of those expenses. The salaries of the officers not being stated, we will venture to presume that the amount is not less, in proportion to the number of prisoners, than that of penitentiaries conducted on the Auburn plan. It appears, by the Report of the Inspectors of the Sing Sing prison, for the year ending September 30th, 1832, (the first one, stating the fact, to which we can promptly refer,) that the salaries of the officers amounted to about \$23,000 for an average of 900 prisoners. At the same rate, the salaries of the officers for the average of 280 convicts at Philadelphia, would be \$7,140. Add this sum to the \$17,529·22, which the other expenses of the prison amount to, and it will make an average of \$88·10 for each prisoner, about double his earnings, and 20 per cent. more than the expenses of the Sing Sing prison in 1832. We have little doubt that we have much underrated the salaries of officers in the Philadelphia prison. It is impossible to make this comparison, however, in a satisfactory manner, without a more detailed statement of the expenses of the establishment than the Inspectors of the Eastern Penitentiary have ever been willing to publish. We do not know whether all the same items are included in the expenses reported by them, which are named in the reports respecting other prisons; and therefore we shall not urge any thing more on this point than to press upon the officers of that institution the duty of giving the world more satisfactory information on a subject which will not be regarded by any as unimportant. If the Philadelphia penitentiary is less expensive, they owe it to themselves and to others, if more so, they

owe it equally to others, to let it be known. The publication cannot do harm, it must do good.

But there is another point connected with the economy of the two plans on which we are sufficiently informed, and in respect to which the comparison is not less unfavorable to the Philadelphia system. It is the comparative cost of the buildings. It was said, we recollect, in one of the reports of the Eastern Penitentiary, that there was some unnecessary expense in the wall and buildings they had erected. We will not, therefore, institute a direct comparison between the actual cost of that edifice and any Auburn prison, for we wish to treat the scheme with the utmost liberality ; and we think we can show, upon general principles, without reference to the particular case in Philadelphia, that the cost of such prisons, that is, of those designed for perpetual solitude of the prisoner, must be vastly greater than of the Auburn prisons. There is that to be done which cannot be effected without greater outlay ; larger cells are to be built, and the walls must be thicker and stronger, where they are so much relied on to prevent communication. Pipes must be laid, and water supplied in a manner not required on the other plan. But it cannot be necessary to enlarge on this ; it will be conceded by every one who gives a single thought to the comparison ; and we believe the actual fact to be, that the same number of prisoners can be suitably provided for, on the Auburn plan, for less than a sixth part of the cost of the buildings necessary on the other.

In original cost, then, and current expenses, and profitable labor, the advantage, as shown by actual and sufficient experience, not by speculative argument merely, is all greatly in favor of the Auburn system. Shall we be told that this is of little consequence in the eye of the philanthropist. We beg leave to dissent from the assertion. Other things being equal, superior economy is a great recommendation ; and thus far we have seen in the Philadelphia plan no countervailing advantage. But the patrons of that plan may be sure of one thing, namely, that the pecuniary advantages of the Auburn system will have great attractions for the legislatures of America ; and that, whether it be perfect or not, it is much more likely to be adopted than theirs. It is the best thing which can be reasonably expected in this country.

We have one point more to touch upon, which has an intimate connexion with all the preceding, and in which we think the Philadelphia system can be shown to be, at the best,

nowise superior to that of Auburn. We refer to the means of supervision, and the punishments used to enforce the rules of the prison. The discipline of such establishments has a direct bearing on their economy, their healthfulness, and their moral influence. There must, of course, in every prison be some of those obstinately refractory spirits, which cannot be affected by ordinary punishment, and with which the severest means consistent with a merciful regard to life and health must be used, to reduce them to the requisite submission. In prisons conducted on the Auburn plan, the use of the whip has been permitted, as well as the dark cell, the stopping of rations, &c.; and we have regretted to see this punishment made the occasion of a good deal of what, we confess, appears to us idle declamation. It is spoken of by Dr. Lieber, among others, in his Appendix to the work of Messrs. de Beaumont and de Tocqueville, as cruel and degrading; and is treated throughout as an insurmountable objection to the scheme which permits it. But we would fain be allowed to ask to whom it is degrading; to those who do, or those who do not, become the subjects of it? It would not be easy to show its injurious effect upon the latter; and as to the former, we think it is carrying the sentiment of sympathy for the dignity of human nature somewhat far, to talk with so much indignation of applying the whip to the back of one of those hardened, perverse, and otherwise incorrigible rogues, who alone can ever be exposed to it. Degrading, forsooth, to one who has already reached the lowest degradation of which human nature seems capable, and who prefers resistance, however hopeless, to submission to rules which are likely to benefit him as much as he is capable of being benefited. We trust we have all due respect for our fellow man, however low in the scale of merit he may be; but we do not wish to render the sentiment ridiculous by carrying it to such an extreme. We are as much inclined to mercy and kindness, as any one who would punish the guilty at all. It is only for their good, and that of society, that we would inflict any suffering; and we must say, we think the least cruel and the least degrading punishment is that, which will soonest bring the subjects of it to order, and thus the soonest place them in the path of amendment. Is it mercy to shut a man up in darkness, and reduce his body by low diet, and suffer his thoughts to rove on every possible dream of malignant vengeance, or vicious hope, rather than inflict four or five blows of a scourge? Is it mercy to gag, or to pinion a prisoner

in a strait jacket, for hours, rather than whip him for a minute? We resign to others such modes of establishing their claim to tenderness of heart and respect for human nature. Let us be understood to speak of the scourge as applied with the utmost circumspection, with every attendant circumstance which can give efficacy to pain, and with every precaution against abuse; to speak of it, in short, as it is used in the Massachusetts State Prison, where it is never applied but in the presence of the warden, who addresses such language to the culprit as should carry to his mind the conviction of its necessity, and the reluctance with which it is inflicted. It is made, as it ought to be, a solemn business; and it is seldom found necessary to give more than three blows. We are not aware that it is, in this way, more liable to abuse than other punishments; and can the rules of a prison be more easily enforced, or with a less amount of suffering?

In respect to that supervision which is necessary in all prisons, it is sufficient to say, that though in the Eastern Penitentiary the prisoner is always liable to inspection, he is not, like one who is at Auburn, or Sing Sing, or Charlestown, actually under the eye of an officer during the whole day. He does not know, to be sure, that he is not watched at any particular moment; but the Auburn prisoner knows that he is watched at every moment. It is supposed by Dr. Lieber, that the perpetual silence of the Auburn scheme cannot be enforced, though he brings no evidence to show it. But it so happens that the French commissioners themselves testify to the fact, that sounds can be communicated from cell to cell in the Philadelphia penitentiary. They say, that the emulation of two weavers was excited, by the sound of their looms, to work more and more rapidly. Now, if the sound of the shuttle can be heard, why not the sound of the voice? We know too, from other evidence, that of the Prison Discipline Society's Reports, that the voice may be heard from cell to cell. Is not equal watchfulness necessary there as at Auburn, and is it not more difficult to secure?

If our views be just, the Philadelphia system is inferior to the other, in internal discipline; in economy, as well in first cost as in current expenses, and in the product of labor; in healthfulness both to the mind and the body; and, last and most important of all, in the means of instruction and of moral and religious influence. It has the advantage in one point only, namely, in the prisoner not being seen by any one but the

officers of the establishment ; though the benefit of this will be small, if communication, as we believe, be practicable from cell to cell, by means of sound. We said at the outset, that this advantage might be purchased too dearly ; and we now leave it to our readers to determine whether it be obtained at too great a sacrifice or not. Were there no other means of obtaining a similar advantage, we should still say, it was not worth all this ; but we are satisfied that much greater benefit may be derived from an establishment, which has long been contemplated, for the reception of such prisoners as are well disposed, yet cannot find the opportunity of redeeming their lost characters in the world, where they shall receive useful and respectable employment, good counsel, and friendly aid. As this institution is not yet ready to go into operation, we do not feel authorized to do more than allude to it, and express our hope soon to see it begun, and our conviction, that, under the guidance of those in whose hands it will probably be, it will be productive of inestimable benefits. In one respect, the establishment we contemplate will be greatly superior in its effect to the Eastern Penitentiary. The prisoner discharged thence must conceal his having been there ; and concealment is so nearly allied to deception, that we confess we have no great relish for it. Its effect on the individual is bad. We should prefer, what we hope we may yet live to see, the repentant criminal acknowledging his guilt before the world, and thus giving the most satisfactory evidence that his reformation is deep, sincere, thorough.

The single advantage we have admitted in the Philadelphia prison, is by no means the only one that has been claimed for it. It was for some time contended, that there were no recommitments there ; and as long as only a small number of prisoners had been discharged, that was true. Now, however, there are as many in proportion as in the Auburn prisons. This was looked upon as one among many proofs of the powerful effect of the system on the character. All were reformed, and therefore none returned. Experience, however, has now shown, that not all, even of those who escape recommitment, are reformed ; and the probability is, that as many are improved in their conduct and character by the Auburn system, as by that of Philadelphia. We say the probability, because we have not the means of ascertaining the point with accuracy. Again, we have to complain of want of information from the managers of the Philadelphia prison. They speak, in their

last Report, of the large number reformed, and the small number of the unimproved. They have, therefore, made inquiries and ascertained something about those discharged thence. Why do they not tell what they know? Have they yet to learn that no plan can be sustained by concealment? It simply implies, that there is something to conceal; and the American people are prompt to draw inferences by no means favorable to what is thus screened. Facts, in minute detail, are what they want, and what, sooner or later, they always obtain. It is well when they are obtained from the right source, as they always have been from the Auburn prisons.

It has been claimed for the Philadelphia system, also, that it is founded on a more philosophical theory than that of Auburn. This is a remark made by Messrs. de Beaumont and de Tocqueville (p. 53); but it is one which we acknowledge we do not understand. We should have said, on the other hand, that a system founded on a principle which is in opposition to man's nature, to the constitution given him by his Maker, as a social being, was less philosophical than one in which that constitution was in some degree regarded. "It is not good for man to be alone." This is the first observation ever made on human nature, and it is as true now as the day the first man was created. Long-continued solitude is not suited to the dependent condition and nature of man; and the alternation of periods of united labor and undisturbed reflection, which is produced by the Auburn plan, strikes us as much the most philosophical, and likely in the end to be the most useful system. Again, at Philadelphia the prisoner's reflections are unguided to any better course than that in which his own dulness, ignorance, or vicious taste may lead him. No regular instruction or moral influence is prepared for him. Is this philosophical? Is this religious? The Inspectors have already answered us. And with the suggestion of this point of comparison of the two systems, we are willing to leave the subject to the consideration of our readers, trusting we have said nothing in the discussion, which can be construed into unkindness to those from whom we differ, and that it will be obvious to others, as it is known to ourselves, that, in this matter, we seek merely for useful truth; that we do not desire "to contradict and confute; nor to believe and take for granted; nor to find talk and discourse; but to weigh and consider."

---

S. A. E.

ART. VII. — 1. *Mirror of Calvinistic Fanaticism, or JEDEDIAH BURCHARD & Co. during a Protracted Meeting of Twenty-six Days in Woodstock, Vermont.* By RUSSELL STREETER. Second Edition. Woodstock. 1835. 16mo. pp. 168.

2. *Sermons, Addresses, and Exhortations, by Rev. JEDEDIAH BURCHARD; with an Appendix, containing some Account of Proceedings during Protracted Meetings, held under his Direction, in Burlington, Williston, and Hinesburgh, Vermont, December, 1835, and January, 1836.* By C. G. EASTMAN. Burlington: Chauncey Goodrich. 12mo. pp. 120.

WE have been deterred from taking earlier notice of the first of the two publications mentioned above, partly by the unwelcomeness of the whole subject to our feelings, and partly by a general dissatisfaction with the manner and tone of the book itself. We do not mean, that the account is not drawn up with fairness and ability, or that we object to the full and free exposition, which the author has given, of the follies and extravagances he undertook to describe. But we can find no excuse for the occasional and unnecessary introduction, on his part, of stale jests and cant phrases, which do not a little to lower the dignity of the narrative, and must materially diminish its usefulness among readers of seriousness and taste. It is not that we are awed in the smallest measure by the cry of fanatics and disorganizers, that there is presumption in opposing and denouncing measures of theirs purporting to proceed from the Spirit of God. The presumption in this matter, if there is any, belongs rather to the ignorance or the effrontery of those who thus dare to put forward their personal or party schemes and devices, under the pretended sanction of a divine impulse. Nevertheless, as all deep and extensive religious excitements involve many of the purest characters, and give birth to feelings and exercises which are never to be adverted to but with tenderness and respect, we dislike to hear even the abuses sometimes attending them, spoken of except in terms of regret, and of evident, though it may be stern solemnity.

Mr. Eastman's book is not liable to objections on this score. It was, indeed, the intention of the publisher to give nothing but

a faithful and exact report of Mr. Burchard's discourses and exhortations ; and engagements were accordingly entered into with a competent stenographer, to attend the meetings held by him, and take down his very words in short-hand. The Appendix grew out of the efforts of Mr. Burchard, and his friends, to frustrate this plan. What could have been their motives in attempting to frustrate it we are at a loss to conjecture, unless we suppose that they were either afraid or ashamed to let the truth be known, and chose rather that their measures, some of them at least, and their mode of urging them, should be as underhanded as they were extraordinary. Considered merely as a publisher's enterprise, it certainly could not have struck them as unprecedented, or even as uncommon, seeing, as they must have done in almost every newspaper, reports of speeches and discourses, obtained in a similar manner, where there was any thing in the nature of the subject or the occasion, or in the notoriety of the speaker, that was likely to give interest to the publication. The discourses of Elias Hicks were published in this way ; Finney's Revival Lectures were also reported as delivered, and published by the Editor of the New York Evangelist. Effectually to obviate all objections grounded on an apprehension, that, in this particular case, the discourses would be garbled, or, at any rate, that Mr. Burchard would not share in the profits accruing from the publication of his own labors, Mr. Goodrich offered to put the manuscripts into his hands for correction, and also, if he would come into the proposed arrangement, to give him a fair compensation for the copyright. We do not see what more Mr. Goodrich could have done ; or in what other way it was possible for the public to come into possession of the requisite materials for making up a deliberate and enlightened judgment respecting Mr. Burchard's peculiar measures, or, as he would have it, his "peculiar manner of illustrating truth."

This man evidently owes most of the influence and notoriety he has obtained among Revivalists, to his having taken up the extravagances of his predecessors, and carried them out a little further. The agitators whom he has thus exceeded and supplanted are alarmed, it is true, or affect to be so, and watch all his motions with suspicion and jealousy ; but the same sort of people who once followed them, now follow him in preference, and probably enough will next year leave him to follow somebody still more extravagant. It is the irremediable vice of the revival system, which, by making religion depend on

artificial excitements, or on excitements of any kind, requires that these excitements should be continually varied and increased, in order that the unnatural cravings they create may be met and satisfied. As for talent or ability, it will not be pretended, of course, that Mr. Burchard has given evidence of possessing any thing like a general power, or accuracy, or enlargement of mind ; but for the single business of agitating a not very enlightened population, his gifts are certainly considerable, and his experience and training such as to turn them to the best account ; his very want of intellectual and moral refinement being one of the secrets of his success. Of his early history we know nothing more than what he has told us himself. "I was as abominable a rebel against the law of God, till I was four-and-twenty years old, as ever trod the earth, rushing headlong to eternal perdition." His air, and manner, and personal appearance, are thus described by Mr. Streeter, in giving an account of his first discourse at Woodstock.

"When Mr. Burchard made his *debut*, his appearance was so different from what was expected by some, and feared by others, that they were taken by surprise. To the superficial observer, his appearance was prepossessing. He has a good forehead, dark searching eyes, and a stern expression of countenance. He was dressed in dandy-like form. All his movements were *slow* and *studied to theatrical exactness*. He opened his psalm-book wide to read, bringing the lids nearly in contact ; and uttered his words generally in a low, impressive voice. His first prayer was singular in the extreme. It was delivered in a key barely above a whisper, as though he were afraid of disturbing the Object or objects of his devotion." — *Mirror, &c.*, pp. 14, 15.

"It must continually be borne in mind, that with Mr. Burchard, '*manner is matter*.' He came here fresh to the work, having rested and restored himself a week at Windsor. He spake with great emphasis, and made *small words* appear large as *mountains*. His discourses were perfectly familiar to him, having been preached hundreds of times. He knew exactly how to pronounce every sentence, so as to produce the greatest effect. He was 'theatrical' in the highest possible degree. He frequently struck his hands together, making a loud report. Every nerve and muscle was called into requisition, and though his action was unsuitable for the pulpit, it answered his purpose. The house at once became a *theatre*, and the news went out as on wings of lightning, that Mr. B. had performed in '*twelve theatres*,' to universal acceptance, but 'got religion' a few years since, and is now the greatest preacher in the world." — *Ibid.*, pp. 16, 17.

Another and more painful question now arises, on which both the books before us are intended to throw some light ; we mean, as to the degree of honesty and sincerity he must be supposed to bring to these efforts. If any confidence is to be placed in the following statements, certified under oath, it is plain that his notions of commercial integrity are not such as to reflect much credit on his character and professions in other respects. That the reader may understand these statements, it is only necessary to premise, that Mr. Burchard, after much importunity, had succeeded at last in purchasing of Mr. Tenney, the stenographer employed by Mr. Goodrich, the shorthand notes of several of his own discourses, which Mr. Tenney had already taken for Mr. Goodrich.

“ Mr. Burchard wished to conceal the fact, that he had bought the manuscripts, (not knowing that any one else was in the secret except Mr. Tenney,) and, with a view to this purpose, proposed the following arrangement. Finding that Mr. Goodrich was wholly unacquainted with stenography, Mr. Burchard proposed that, on his return from his journey, Mr. Tenney should offer him *counterfeit sermons*, which were to be made simply by scribbling over a number of the books, such as had been used in writing down the sermons, with stenographic characters, put down at random. These were to be given to Mr. Goodrich on his return, as the *genuine manuscripts*. Mr. Burchard told Mr. Tenney that this was the only means by which he (Burchard) could conceal the fact, that he had bought the manuscripts, and that, when Mr. Goodrich called on him to write out the notes for the press, he must tell him ‘*that he could not conscientiously do it*, — that he had altered his mind, as to Mr. Burchard and his measures, and that as he had made no agreement to copy them for the press, he would not do it.’ Mr. Tenney objected, that if he should desist from taking his sermons at any time before the meeting closed, people would at once conjecture that he (Burchard) had hired him to do so. This difficulty was to be removed by the following arrangement. Mr. Burchard marked a number of small books, such as were used in taking down sermons, with a private mark, and Mr. Tenney was to continue, as usual, to write in the church, and to use the books which Mr. Burchard had marked. These were to be handed to him at the anxious-seats, if it could be done without observation ; if not, they were to be delivered to him after the meeting, or in the crowd, while the people were going out. For these sermons also, *counterfeits* were to be prepared and presented to Mr. Goodrich as *genuine*, as before stated. In order to enable Mr. Tenney to do this, Mr. Burchard supplied him with the texts of all the sermons he had preached in this place.” — *Sermons, &c.*, pp. 83, 84.

Many other facts are stated, which will go far to create a suspicion in some minds, that he is never less serious, than when for obvious reasons he puts on the appearance of being most so. Take, for example, an extract from an account of a scene in the Inquiry Room, given by Mr. Metcalf, the gentleman referred to therein, and known at the time by Mr. Burchard to be unaffected by what was going on around him, and to be capable of seeing through the whole.

"Having gained such a victory, he returned to me again and said, 'O, friend Metcalf, I wish you could give up your heart; but I suppose you can't,' — and smiled.\*

"Then, all those who had given their hearts to God, were told to rise up, and when Mr. B. had questioned and advised each one, Mr. Southgate registered the names among the hopefully converted. Standing near me, he commenced with a large lad or young man, who was next at hand, by saying, 'Now, you have given your heart to God; and it is infinitely the most solemn act of your whole life.' (The young man was sighing and sobbing, and Mr. B. put his hand upon my knee, and gave it a gentle *grip*.) 'If you go back into the world and live as you did before conversion, you will sin against the Holy Ghost, and be damned for ever; for that sin can't be forgiven. Now, young man, do you give yourself up to God, to be saved or damned, as God may see fit?' 'Yes, Sir,' was the reply, in a whimpering voice; and Mr. B. gave my knee another grip. I could hardly keep my countenance; not *knowing* whether the *sign* was *gracious* or *roguish*. The young convert was *finished off* with a prayer, and the scribe directed to put down his name. He went over with the whole, a dozen or more, in the same way, calling each one by *name* in prayer, and implying that their souls were saved, and their sins were forgiven." — *Mirror, &c.*, pp. 130 – 132.

We cannot omit to notice, in this connexion, another charge, often advanced or insinuated in the book last quoted, and confirmed from other sources. "The matter is now conceded," says Mr. Streeter, "that Mr. Burchard is upon a *money-making* game. At the rate he is going on, he and his 'Episcopalian' lady, will clear *three* or *four thousand* dollars in a year. Their wages here, were not less than four hundred dollars per month!"

After all, however, we cannot bring ourselves to believe, but that Mr. Burchard is, in the main, sincere and honest in that sense in which alone most of the one-sided, "one idea" zealots of the present day can be said to be so. The history

---

\* "He then told me a long story about a club of opposers whom he converted, one after another, at Lockport, called '*the five hard heads*.'"

of the apparent and real moral obliquities of this description of persons, (and society was never more plagued with them on all sorts of subjects than now,) would seem to be this. By dwelling almost exclusively on one measure or project, and greatly exaggerating its relative importance, and allowing themselves to become unduly excited respecting it, they gradually lose the power of accurate moral discrimination, at least in regard to all questions implicated in the matter in hand. At length the judgment, and conscience, and whole mind, become radically and permanently disordered; so that right will often strike them as wrong, and wrong as right, according as it promises to hinder or promote the desired object. And in such a case we cannot properly say, that they are insincere or dishonest in regard to this or that particular act: we can only say, that by a blind zeal, often aided doubtless by ambition, and vanity, and still more sordid interests, their whole intellectual and moral nature has become perverted and corrupted in itself.

Some, we are aware, would prefer to have no notice whatever taken of a fanatic whose ignorance and coarse taste mark all his performances; but such persons are more fastidious than wise. Considered merely as a study elucidating the natural history of religion, and indicating the liability of tolerably enlightened communities to contagious delusions, it certainly is neither uninteresting nor useless to trace the causes and effects of every new manifestation of the revival principle. Besides, Mr. Burchard on many accounts is not a man to be despised; his ability to do mischief is not to be measured by his ability to do good, and the best security of the public against it is to be found in apprizing them beforehand of the true character and tendency of what is peculiar in his spiritual mechanics. There is more to alarm us in the vaunt than in the argument contained in the peroration of his introductory sermon at Woodstock.

"So you see, my friends, that I have only *taken your hearts right out, and held them up NAKED* before you, and *turned them over and over*, that you might see them. There's no mystery — no charm about this matter. You can all understand it. I do here, just as I did at Springfield, Acworth, Perkinsville, and Grafton, where God poured out his Holy Spirit with power, and lawyers, physicians, merchants, farmers, mechanics, &c. were converted and enjoyed the hope of salvation in their souls. Was it not the work of the Holy Ghost there, or were these men of intellect

and learning such fools as to come right forward and take the anxious-seats and give their hearts to God, when it was the effect of mechanism and fanaticism, instead of the Spirit of God? Hark! look here; I have seen men of the greatest intellect — judges, and senators, and generals, and colonels, and captains, come and get *down upon their knees and ask prayers of a feeble piece of clay*, and God Almighty sent the Holy Ghost right into their souls, and they were converted [slapping his hands together] in a moment." — *Ibid.*, pp. 27, 28.

Mr. Burchard complains, that the most formidable opposition encountered by him wherever he goes, is not from sinners and misbelievers, but from the lukewarmness of men professing to be orthodox, and friendly to revivals "in the abstract," though not to *his* revivals. Accordingly, he does not hesitate to denounce these mincers of Calvinism, as no better than temporizers and "dumb dogs."

"Some preachers" says he, "are afraid to preach the plan of salvation, as the Scriptures declare it. They darsn't say to transgressors, you *will go to hell and be damned eternally*, unless God has *elected* you to eternal life, and *decreed* your salvation according to his unalterable purpose. They are afraid of offending some of the church that can't bear this doctrine, or some of the congregation that don't like such *harsh* preaching. So they *fritter*, and *fritter*, and *fritter* away the doctrine of election and decrees and endless damnation, till it is good for just nothing at all. They are afraid to say, 'Sinner, you will go to hell and be damned for ever, unless God Almighty elected you to eternal life, before the world was made, the planets moved, or the sun shone in the firmament.' They want to please everybody, — so they speak smooth things, and spend a whole week in writing one or two discourses, which they deliver on the Sabbath in such a genteel way, that nobody is offended. The hearers say, 'What a *mild preacher* we have got here; how pleasantly he speaks. He don't preach about decrees, and purposes, and eternal damnation. He is a fine man; *Come, let us go over to the tavern and take something to drink.*' Ha! that's the way then, is it, to teach transgressors? — *The way to lead them to hell!!* Never was a sinner truly converted to God, by such miserable stuff. I have no allusion to the preaching here, nor to any person now present. But I tell you that I an't afraid to preach *Calvinism*. Thank God, I *am a Calvinist*, and an't ashamed to own it." — *Ibid.*, pp. 76, 77.

He not only avows his innovations on the practice of other revivalists, particularly as regards the summary manner in which he hurries through the processes of conviction and conversion, but alleges reasons for the same, which those who

maintain the expediency of artificial revivals, or who believe that these movements are to be resolved into special influences of God's Spirit, will not find it easy to set aside.

"But stop, sir, look here, — you like *improvements* in every thing excepting religion? Must things always go on the same old way? When I was young, we used to winnow grain with a fan, and it was slow work. Afterward, a machine was invented that would work much faster. And if an invention should be sought out by which one man would winnow an hundred bushels in a day, you would be pleased with it. The more work it would turn off, the better. So it should be in revivals. I used to work a week, as hard as I could, to get eight, nine, ten, eleven, converted. And when we made twenty converts in a week, it was noised all about the country, as though we had wrought wonders. But now you see I count an hundred, and a hundred and ten, as at Grafton, Chester, Springfield, and Acworth. And I expect to live to see the day, when I shall see *three thousand* souls converted in a day. Yes, three thousand souls saved from hell in a day!" — *Ibid.*, pp. 48, 49.

As for advising people to go home, and examine themselves, and read their Bibles, and pray, he does not hesitate to pronounce it to be "a delusion of the old tempting Devil," — a mere fetch on the part of the Enemy of souls, in order to gain time. He also says, in another place,

"There is no merit in a long conviction. God never required any such thing. If a boy hated his father, do you think he would get any praise for delaying to do his duty and becoming a dutiful son? No! every day he continued in rebellion would enhance his guilt. There is an error which prevails very extensively in regard to this subject. A man is seeking for salvation: he has been four weeks under conviction. The minister tells him to go home and read his Bible and pray, and if he continues in the same state of mind, he may conclude that he has got the '*effectual calling*,' and if not, that it's only the '*common calling*.' Well, if the man concludes that he has got the effectual calling, at the end of some weeks he is taken into the Church. 'There,' says the deacon, 'mark my words, there's a man that'll wear.' Now, my friends, this is wrong — wholly wrong." — *Sermons, &c.*, p. 18.

Again, in a discourse on our Lord's stretching forth his hand to save Peter, he goes into the following characteristic defence of his own way of doing these things, in an imaginary conversation between the Apostle, after he is safely on board the vessel, and the Saviour.

"Another query which might have arisen in Peter's mind. 'I don't know as I was in the water *long enough*. I rather think I

ought to have been there about three weeks!' 'What's that, Peter?' 'Why — I am afraid I was not in the water long enough. — If I had only laid there three weeks, then the Master might have taken me out, and it would have been a complete cure. — I should have felt perfectly safe.' 'Well, Peter, is there any other reason why you feel dissatisfied?' 'O yes. I don't know — I believe I *didn't feel bad enough* when I was in the water! I ought to have gone down two or three times, (I believe they drown the third time,) but if I remember, I didn't go down *at all*. I don't believe I felt bad enough. They say it is *indispensably necessary* to feel *like death* in order to be safe.' 'O! what nonsense!' — *Ibid.*, p. 25.

The two measures on which Mr. Burchard chiefly relies as the means of "breaking down" sinners, and inducing them to "submit to God," are Special Prayers, and the Anxious-Seat. The converts, on saying at the Anxious-Seats that they "give up their hearts," are passed next into the Inquiry Room, where they are called upon to answer a series of questions proposed by Mr. Burchard, and introduced thus; "Now if you will tell me the truth, I will tell you eighteen times out of twenty; yea, ninety-five times out of one hundred; yea, more, ninety-eight times out of one hundred, who are Christians." This done, their names are *immediately* enrolled for admission into the Church. Mrs. Burchard, also, has her "Department," meanwhile, doing for the children what her husband does for the adults.

Mr. Burchard's own account of what once befell him at the Anxious Seats, will let our readers sufficiently into "the history and mystery" of his operations.

"In one of our large towns, where I held a protracted meeting, some years since, salvation was flowing like a mighty river. Forty or fifty frequently gave up their hearts to Christ in a single day, and it continued so for days together. Well, one day, (we had the anxious-seats in the basement story,) I sent some of the professors up stairs to pray, while I was conversing with the sinners on the anxious-seats. The result was glorious. Seat after seat full gave up their hearts to God, and I felt the spirit of God in my very soul. At last I got the seat filled, (it was the third or fourth time, I believe,) and they would n't give up their hearts, *not a soul of them*. I sent the deacon up stairs to see what the matter was, for I concluded the trouble was there *if anywhere*, for I felt cold, stupid, and disheartened. Well, the deacon went up; not a single professor was praying; but, there stood a *great, tall, country*

*gawky, speechafying!* The deacon told me what the case was; I went up, and *ordered the fellow to stop, and told the people to get down on their knees, and go to God in prayer.* They did so. I felt the Holy Spirit come right down *rush! rush! rush!* into my soul. Salvation came right into the hearts of those very sinners, who just before had been *so obstinate.* They submitted to Christ, the very moment I asked them. They were converted and I had the pleasure of seeing them taken into the Church myself. Well, I got on another seat full; I couldn't do any thing at all with them. So I went up myself to see what the matter was *now,* and found the people had all *cleared out home!* I went back and *dismissed the meeting immediately.* It was n't of any use to go on and keep 'em there waiting, unless prayers were ascending up to the throne in their behalf. Now, there is nothing but prayer—the prayer of faith, that will bring salvation to the people of Burlington. You can't *speechafy a soul out of hell.*”—*Ibid.*, pp. 118, 119.

It is hardly to be supposed that there are *many* among the “judges, and senators, and generals, and colonels, and captains” of Vermont, who can be made to witness such proceedings, or listen to such discourses, except with feelings of unmitigated disgust. The Protracted Meeting at Woodstock, which lasted *twenty-six days*, was regarded, we believe, by those engaged in getting it up, as signally blessed; yet what were the immediate results? It divided and estranged families and friends; it gave infinite occasion for scoffing at religion in general; it was pronounced by a vote of the town a public nuisance; and of those whom it made serious for a time, but a very small proportion, judging from past experience, can be expected to persevere, the rest relapsing into a state of sin or indifference, which, all admit, commonly proves much worse, and more hopeless, than before.

“Let not an intelligent community,” says Mr. Streeter, “be deceived by the rumors of Mr. Burchard's success, in this place, as well as others. For, considering the duration of the meeting, the efforts that were put forth, and the circumstances of the case, it was ‘a mountain in labor.’ There are, in this town, and those adjoining, *ten thousand* souls. The weather and sleighing were excellent, during the whole twenty-six or twenty-seven days, and people came from various directions, in the circumference of more than an hundred miles in diameter. Whole families of children, from three or four years old and upwards, were put under Mr. and Mrs. Burchard's care, to manage or mangle them as they pleased; and all who would be made to *say* that they ‘gave their hearts to

God,' were reckoned as converts. Some of them, as facts declare, only said it, to get out of the clutches of the inquisitor. Well, instead of *thousands*, the braggadocio reported only *four hundred*, not half of whom can now be produced. And, although people were hurried into the churches, before they got cold, (lest, as Mr. Burchard said, the Devil should catch more than half of them,) including unstable youth, and little, inexperienced children, yet the whole number amounted to only one hundred and twenty. Why, a Mormonite with half the advantages that Mr. Buchard had, would make *three* converts to his *one*." — *Mirror*, &c., pp. 165, 166.

At the same time, in another view of the subject, it is gratifying to trace the wisdom of Divine Providence, in permitting these extravagances, for the good they have done, and are still doing, indirectly. They serve to open the eyes of the public, and keep them awake, to the flagrant abuses incident to the revival system, and lead to inquiries and discussions which can hardly fail, sooner or later, effectually to expose the radical error on which that system proceeds. Moreover, it is due to the revival system itself, to say, that we are indebted to it for creating life under the ribs of a dead orthodoxy, which had previously lain like an incubus on the mind of the country, and for diffusing, among the Orthodox themselves, a freer spirit in regard to doctrines as well as measures, which, by paving the way to the establishment and triumph of what is called the New-School party, is likely, in no great length of time, to rid the American Churches, at least, of every vestige of proper Calvinism.

ED.

---

#### NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

*A Sketch of the Reformation.* By THOMAS B. FOX. Boston : James Munroe & Co. 1836. 12mo. pp. 257. — We have here the fourth volume of Professor Ware's "Sunday Library for Young Persons." One on a more interesting and suitable topic could hardly have been desired. Though "A Sketch," merely, as it could not but be, within the limits assigned, it is evidently drawn up with much study and care ; and the selection and arrangement of the materials, and the general style of the composition are such, as cannot fail to make it a popular, as well as useful work. Mr. Fox has judged wisely, considering the age and character of the readers for whose benefit it is particularly designed, in throwing his narrative as much as possible into the form of a series of biographies of the leading reformers in different countries, and in interspersing liberally personal anecdotes, illustrative of the times,

as well as of the men and their cause. Were we to object to the book on any account, it would be, that the writer has touched too gently on the glaring faults of many of the reformers, and particularly of Luther; and that he has not taken sufficient pains to mark and enforce the distinction between the "Principles of the Reformation," properly so called, and the doctrines, or theological system of the reformers themselves, in the leading articles of which they did not differ materially from the Catholics.

---

*Hug's Introduction to the New Testament.* Translated from the Third German Edition. By DAVID FOSDICK, Jr. With *Notes* by M. STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Andover: Gould & Newman. 1836. Svo. pp. 788. — We are happy to announce the appearance of a second English version of this valuable work, the first, by Dr. Wait, (London, 1827, 2 vols. 8vo.,) being absolutely intolerable. The present translation is executed throughout with ability and taste, and is taken, moreover, from a later edition of the original, revised, and considerably enlarged by the author. Hug, to borrow Professor Stuart's words, "is a Roman Catholic, with a kind of Protestant heart," and is said by Gesenius, with direct reference to this Introduction, "to excel all his predecessors in deep and fundamental investigations." The "Notes" are valuable as containing a summary of, or references to the more recent German Literature on the various subjects discussed. This work in its present dress, will, at much less expense, more than supply the place of Bishop Marsh's edition of Michaelis, or Mr. Horne's indigested, superficial, unsatisfactory compilation.

---

*Passow's Greek Lexicon.* — We understand that Professor C. C. Felton, of Cambridge, is engaged in the preparation of a new Greek Lexicon. It is to be an exact translation of Franz Passow's German Greek Lexicon, accommodated as nearly as possible to our English idioms. Passow's Dictionary has already reached the fourth edition, and is acknowledged, by the London Quarterly Review, and by eminent Greek scholars of our own country, to be unrivalled. Although there are Greek Lexicons in English of considerable merit, the want of one more full and exact is beginning to be widely felt; and this want Professor Felton proposes to supply, by giving the whole of Passow, including his last additions, worked up into the body of the book. Professor Felton is already known to the public by his accurate and beautiful edition of Homer, which has met with universal favor among competent judges; and this, together with his zeal in the pursuit of Greek literature and his fine classical taste, leaves no doubt on our minds, as to the success, in every point of view, of his new enterprise.

---

## INDEX.

---

### A.

- American Germans, some account of, 47.
- Angels, Jewish conceptions of the origin and nature of, 219.
- Angel of Jehovah, meaning of this title as used in Scripture, article on, 207 *et seq.* — affirmed to be a distinct being from Jehovah himself, 208 — objections to the theory of Hengstenberg, who makes this angel the second person in the Trinity, 211 — examination of passages of Scripture adduced in support of this theory, 212 — Jewish conceptions of the nature of angels, 219 — light which the Septuagint throws on this subject, 224 — the Apocrypha, 225 — Josephus, 226 — Philo, 228 — the Jewish Cabalists, 234 — the Jews did not believe this angel to be one with God, 239 — not identical with the Messiah, 329 — Hengstenberg's authorities to the contrary from the Old Testament, examined, 330 — and from the New, 332 — Jewish tradition, 335 — Unitarianism of the Jews, 336 — Jews never believed in the identity of the Angel of Jehovah and the Messiah, 338 — conclusion, 342.
- Apostles' Creed, Bishop Hopkins's misstatements respecting, 344 — opinions of scholars in regard to its authenticity, 345 — history of the Creed, 347 — creeds of earlier date, 349 — history of the different classes of, 352.

### B.

- Backslider, The, reviewed and commended, 198 *et seq.*
- Bancroft, Dr., his Half-Century Discourse, reviewed, 240 — retrospect of ecclesiastical transactions during his ministry, 243 — annals of his parish, 245 — his own merits and sacrifices, 247.

Barnes's Notes on the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle to the Romans, reviewed and highly commended, 66 *et seq.* — the Author convicted of heresy by the Synod of Philadelphia, *ib.* — his principles and spirit as a commentator, 67 — some defects noticed, 71.

Bartlett, Dr. E., his Laws of Sobriety noticed, 72, 80.

Beaumont, M. de, one of the French Commissioners whose Report on the American Penitentiary System is reviewed, 376.

Bokum's Stranger's Gift, noticed, 47. Bridgewater Treatise. See *Rogel*.

Burchard, Jedediah, the Vermont Revivalist, some account of his character and proceedings, 393.

### C.

Cabalists, on the Angel of Jehovah, or the Metatron, 234, 335.

Carpenter, Dr., his Harmony of the Gospels, noticed, 270.

Chalmers, Dr., notice of, 268.

Channing, Dr., notice of Glasgow edition of his Works, 269.

Chenevière's Sermon at the Jubilee in Geneva, noticed, 106.

Christianity Vindicated, by Bishop Hopkins, a notice of, 343.

Clergy, their office as educators of the People. See *Education of the People*.

Codman, Dr., his Narrative of a Visit to England, briefly noticed, 265.

Comprehensive Commentary. See *Jenks*.

Cox's Life of Melancthon, reviewed. See *Melancthon*.

Creeds, origin of, 343 — on the authenticity of the Apostles' Creed, 344 — Creeds of earlier date than the Apostles' Creed, 349 — that of Irenæus, *ib.* — three Creeds of Tertullian, 350. See *Apostles' Creed* — Creed of Athanasius, 373.

## D.

Duties, importance of small and common, 294, 299.

## E.

Eastman's Account of the Proceedings of Jedediah Burchard, with specimens of his Sermons, Addresses, and Exhortations, 393.

Education of the People, article on, 153 — Government unfit to determine its character, 155 — education of adults, more important than that of children, 156 — the Clergy should be the educators of the people, 158 — and should give more of their attention to the improvement of society, 159 — they should beware of becoming disorganizers, 162 — the Clergy have been misled by mysticism, 164 — and thus have impaired their influence, 167 — which they must recover by allying themselves to the dominant spirit of the age, social progress, 168 — no philosophy of education as yet, 202.

## F.

Farewell to Time, noticed, 170.

Fathers, the early, their authority as interpreters of Scripture, 355 — their views of the Trinity, 357, 363, 368 — Professor Stuart's concessions, 369.

Fox's Sketch of the Reformation, 403.

## G.

Geneva, the Jubilee there, being the third centennial celebration of the commencement of the Reformation, 106 — the great men who promoted the Reformation in that city, 108.

German settlers in this country, some account of, 47 — degraded moral and intellectual condition of those in Pennsylvania, 48 — condition of those in the vicinity of Boston, 50.

Goodwin's Lectures on the Atheistical Controversy, 136.

## H.

Hengstenberg's theory respecting the Angel of Jehovah, examined and

refuted, 211 — his arguments to prove the Angel of Jehovah identical with the Messiah, exposed, 329.

Hopkins, Bishop, his Publications reviewed, 342 *et seq.* — betrays great ignorance respecting the Apostles' Creed, 344 — his opinion of the Fathers as interpreters exposed, 355 — resembles the Fathers in his defence of the Trinity, 359 — denounces Temperance Societies, 367 — strictures on his Discourses on the Evidences, 374.

Hug's Introduction to the N. T., 404.

## I.

Impartial Exposition of Christian Evidences and doctrines. See *McCulloh*.

Infusory animalcules, some account of, 147.

## J.

Jenks, Dr., his Comprehensive Commentary reviewed, 54 *et seq.* — its mechanical execution, 55 — use made of Henry's Commentary, 57 — of Scott, Doddridge, and others, 59 — policy of concealment in regard to views not orthodox, 61 — moral tone objectionable, 64 — Baptist edition of it, 66.

Josephus, on the Angel of Jehovah, 226.

## L.

Last Supper, The, noticed, 169.

Living Temple. See *True Plan of*.  
Lothrop, Rev. S. K., his Address before the Massachusetts Temperance Society, 72, 83.

Lücke, Dr., his Recollections of Schleiermacher, a translation of, 7.

## M.

Martineau, Harriet, her Miscellanies, reviewed, 251 — great diversity of subjects, 254 — her Remarks on the Female Characters of Sir Walter Scott, 256 — her honesty and boldness, 260 — her views of religion, 262.

Matter, Professor, his work, *De l'Influence des Mœurs, &c.*, reviewed, 153.

- McCulloh's Impartial Exposition of the Evidences and Doctrines of the Christian Religion, reviewed, 307— treatise originated in parental solicitude, 308 — attempts to repudiate natural religion, 310 — finds no support in nature for the moral attributes of God, or for moral distinctions, 312 — credibility of the sacred writers, 316 — rejects original sin, and the Trinity, 320 — his charges against Unitarians refuted, 321.
- Melancthon, Philip, Cox's Life of, reviewed, 273 *et seq.* — his birth and education, 275 — his remarkable proficiency, 276 — becomes acquainted with Luther, 277 — sides with the reformers, 279 — their leader during Luther's confinement, 281 — assists Luther in translating the Scriptures, 282 — writes the celebrated "Confession of Augsburg," 284 — accused of time-serving, 286 — approves of the burning of Servetus, 288 — his death and character, 389.
- Miscellanies by Harriet Martineau, reviewed and commended, 251.
- Morning and Evening Sacrifice, The, noticed, 169.
- N.
- Natural Theology, Bridgewater Treatise on. See *Roget*. — favored by a study of Natural History, 137 — the argument from design and final causes, 139 — rejected by Dr. McCulloh, 310.
- P.
- Passow's Greek Lexicon, 404.
- Penitentiary System of the United States, article on, 376 — Philadelphia and Auburn plans compared, and the latter preferred and defended, 381.
- Philo on the Angel of Jehovah, 228.
- Primitive Church, compared with the Protestant Episcopal Church at the present Day, by Bishop Hopkins, review of, 343 — merits of the early Fathers as interpreters of Scripture, 355 — their views of the Trinity, 357, 363 — causes of the misapprehension of them on this subject, 364 — Bishops in, the same with Presbyters, 367.
- Primitive Creed, Examined and Explained, by Bishop Hopkins, reviewed, 342 — Creeds of earlier date than the Apostles' Creed, 349. See *Apostles' Creed*.
- Prisons, the Philadelphia and Auburn plans of, compared, 381.
- R.
- Rationalists, some notices of, 3, 32.
- Religious Consolation, notice of, 272.
- Roget, Dr., his Bridgewater Treatise, on Animal and Vegetable Physiology considered with reference to Natural Theology, 137 — on Final Causes, 140 — particular evidences of design, 142 — on the Infusoria, 147.
- S.
- Sacred Memoirs, noticed, 136.
- Sacred Offering, The, noticed, 135.
- Schleiermacher as a Theologian, article on, 1 *et seq.* — his position in regard to the Rationalists and Supernaturalists, 2 — brief sketch of the principal incidents in his life, 6 — Dr. Lücke's Recollections of him, translated, 7 — marks an important transition in German Theology, 8 — his early training among the Moravians, 9 — the elements of his mind and character, 11, — his "Discourses on Religion, addressed to the Educated among its Despisers," 16 — accused of Pantheism, 18 — his "Critical Letters on the First Epistle to Timothy," 19 — his "Critical Essay on the Writings of Luke," 22 — his merits as a Scriptural interpreter, 23 — his "Exposition of a Course of Theological Study," 26 — his great work, "The Doctrines of Christian Faith, according to the Principles of the Evangelical Church," 29 — his merits as a lecturer, 33 — as a preacher, 35 — his personal character, 40 — manner of his death, 44.
- Servetus, notice of, 288.
- Stranger's Gift, The, noticed, 47.
- Streeter, Rev. Mr., his Mirror of Calvinistic Fanaticism, noticed, 393.
- Stuart, Professor, on the early history of the Trinity, 369.

## T.

- Temperance Convention, Proceedings of, reviewed, 73, 89, 92.
- Temperance Reform, State of, article on, 72 *et seq.* — notice of its commencement, 73, — objections to it as a combination to effect good objects by public agitation, stated and overruled, 74 — enormity of the evil to be corrected, 77 — objections to the plan of extending the pledge so as to include fermented liquors, 79 — destroys the simplicity of the pledge, 81 — use of fermented liquors less injurious than that of distilled, 83 — laws to be obeyed in the gratification of the appetites, 85 — bad taste and bad temper in the defence of Temperance, 91 — intolerance on the subject, 92 — the argument of expediency, considered, 93 — extent of wine-drinking in this country, 96 — wine at the communion, 102 — state of Temperance Reform in England, 267 — Bishop Hopkins on, 307.
- Tocqueville, M. de, one of the French Commissioners, whose Report on the American Penitentiary System is reviewed, 376.
- Trinity not more defensible than Transubstantiation, 134 — rejected by Dr. McCulloh as unscriptural, 320 — how held and defended by the Fathers, 357, 364, 368 — Bishop Hopkins's defence of, 359 — Professor Stuart on the early history of, 369 — concessions of other Trinitarians, 369 — early councils on, 372.
- True Plan of a Living Temple, Works of the Author of, reviewed, 169 — this work compared with Howe's Living Temple, 171 — its theological character, 175 — its literary defects, 181 — view it gives of the kingdom of God upon earth, 184 — peculiar aspects of life, 189 — perfection of man, 193 — best

mode of accomplishing the great object of life, 291 — the Ideal, 292 — the Actual, 293 — doctrine of small duties, 294 — rules and maxims of a good life, 296 — just estimate of the duties of common life, 299 — worldly-mindedness and heavenly-mindedness, 304.

## U.

- Unitarianism, embraced by Blanco White, 126 — its mode of worship commended, 128 — state of, in France, 265 — defended against Dr. McCulloh's aspersions, 312 — Unitarianism of the Jews, 336 — and of the early Fathers, 368.

## W.

- Wine. Extent of wine-drinking in this country, 96 — wine at the communion injurious interference with, in the Temperance Reform, 102.
- White, Rev. Joseph Blanco, his Life and Writings, article on, 111 *et seq.* — his birth and education, 112 — qualifies himself for the priesthood, 115 — takes the vows of the sacred office, 117 — becomes an unbeliever, 118 — escapes to England, 120 — recovers his faith in Christianity and takes orders in the Church of England, 121 — embarrassed on the subject of the Trinity, 122 — publishes his "Evidence against Catholicism," 125 — becomes a Unitarian, 126 — the Author of "Second Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion," 129 — his view of the State of the Primitive Church, 130 — publishes his "Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy," 133 — transubstantiation as defensible as the Trinity, 134 — proposes to publish at some future day "A Sketch of my Mind in England," 135.





THE NEW TESTAMENT in the Common Version, conformed to Griesbach's standard Greek text. Third Edition. 12mo.

A HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS, on the Plan proposed by LANT CARPENTER, LL. D.

THE TEACHER'S GIFT TO HIS PUPILS,  
WITH NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS. (Second Edition.)

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL SINGING-BOOK; to which are added a few Moral Songs. By GEORGE KINGSLEY. Approved by the Boston Sunday-School Society. 1 vol. 16mo.

A NEW TRANSLATION  
OF THE  
HEBREW PROPHETS,

Arranged in chronological order. Vol. I. — containing Joel, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah.

By GEORGE R. NOYES.

The *Book of Job* and the *Psalms* have also been translated by Mr. Noyes, and published. The estimation in which these translations are held, may be ascertained in some degree from the following extracts: —

"No translation has appeared in England since that of Isaiah by Lowth, which can sustain a comparison with that of the book of Job, by Mr. Noyes. With some slight exceptions, this latter is very much what we could wish it to be." — *Spirit of the Pilgrims*.

"We cordially welcome this book of Psalms in its new and inviting form. It was with satisfaction we heard of Mr. Noyes's undertaking; one of the most useful and important, as well as responsible, in which a scholar and a theologian can engage. The religious public are already indebted to his labors for the Translation of Job. Those of our readers, — and we hope they are not few, — who are familiar with that excellent work, will already have anticipated benefit and gratification from this. And though it was not to be expected, that so much was to be done, because there was not so much needed, for the improvement of a devotional work, like the Psalms, as for the obscure and difficult book of Job, yet every intelligent reader will perceive in this the same fidelity, good judgment, and taste, which so highly recommended his former translation." — *Christian Register*.

These works have also been very favorably noticed in the *North American Review*, *Christian Examiner*, *N. Y. American*, *Philadelphia National Gazette*, and numerous other periodicals and books.

CHEAP AND SPLENDID FAMILY BIBLE,  
WITHOUT NOTE OR COMMENT;

*In two vols. Imperial Octavo.*

The publisher believes he can say with confidence, that this is one of the most elegant and accurate editions of the Holy Scriptures, that have appeared in any country.

The paper is of extra quality, the type large and very clear; and yet from its being in two octavo volumes, it is perfectly convenient for use. It has all the advantages of a quarto volume, without its unwieldy clumsiness. Two beautiful engravings, by Hatch and Smillie, accompany the work; one of them is from Cole's painting of the "Garden of Eden," the other from Correggio's celebrated painting of "Mary Magdalene reading the Scriptures."

The price in sheets is \$5; bound in glazed cambric, \$6; in sheep, \$6.50; in calf, at various prices, according to the style.

THE  
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

CHARLES BOWEN,  
NO. 141, WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON.

AGENTS.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

PORTSMOUTH, J. W. Foster.  
EXETER, F. Grant.  
DOVER, & } G. & E. Wadleigh.  
GREAT FALLS, }  
KEENE, George Tilden.  
CONCORD, Marsh, Capen, & Lyon.

MASSACHUSETTS.

CAMBRIDGE, J. Owen.  
CONCORD, J. Stacy.  
TAUNTON, F. Dunbar.  
SALEM, { Foote & Chisholm.  
H. Whipple.  
DANVERS, A. Trask, Jr.  
NEWBURYPORT, Charles Whipple.  
HINGHAM, C. & E. B. Gill.  
NEW BEDFORD, William Howe.  
NANTUCKET, George W. Ewer.  
GROTON, A. Richardson.  
GREENFIELD, David Clark, Jr.  
WORCESTER, C. Harris.  
SPRINGFIELD, Elisha Edwards.  
NORTHAMPTON, J. H. Butler.  
LOWELL, R. Meacham.

MAINE.

PORTLAND, Colman & Chisholm.  
HALLOWELL, C. Spaulding.  
BELFAST, E. T. Morrill.  
AUGUSTA, G. S. Carpenter & Co.  
BANGOR, Nourse & Smith.  
EASTPORT, B. Williams.

RHODE ISLAND.

PROVIDENCE, { George Dana.  
B. Cranston & Co.

CONNECTICUT.

NEW HAVEN, Herrick & Noyes.  
HARTFORD, Canfield & Robins.

VERMONT.

BURLINGTON, Smith & Harrington.

NEW JERSEY.

TRENTON, D. Fenton.

NEW YORK.

ALBANY, W. C. Little.  
NEW YORK, C. S. Francis.  
TRENTON, Isaac B. Pierce.  
CANANDAIGUA, Morse & Harvey.  
AUBURN, H. Ivison & Co.  
BUFFALO, O. G. Steele.  
ROCHESTER, C. & M. Morse.

PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILADELPHIA, { Jas. Kay, Jr. & Brother.  
Samuel King.  
PITTSBURG, Kay & Co.

MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE, I. S. Homans.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON, P. Thompson.

VIRGINIA.

RICHMOND, R. D. Sanxay.  
NORFOLK, C. Hall.

KENTUCKY.

LEXINGTON, C. Wallace.

OHIO.

CINCINNATI, E. Deming.  
MARIETTA, N. Ward.

NORTH CAROLINA.

RALEIGH, J. Gales & Son.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

CHARLESTON, Thomas Cousins.  
COLUMBIA, B. D. Plant.

GEORGIA.

AUGUSTA, W. J. Hobby.  
SAVANNAH, Thomas Purse & Co.

ALABAMA.

MOBILE, S. Smith.

TENNESSEE.

NASHVILLE, W. A. Eichbaum.  
CHRISTIANVILLE, B. S. Parsons.

MISSISSIPPI.

NATCHEZ, Beaumont & Williams.

LOUISIANA.

NEW ORLEANS, E. Johns & Co.

The work will be sent *by mail* to any part of the United States on the remittance of one year's subscription (four dollars) to the Publisher, Boston, or to any of the agents, — subscribers paying postage, and taking the risk of conveyance.

The subscription becomes due on the publication of the second number; that is, on the 1st of May. Distant subscribers are expected to transmit the amount of their yearly subscriptions as soon as they receive the second number of each year.

